An Historical

VINDICATION

OF THE

Naked Gospel,

Recommended to the

University of Oxford.

LONDON:

Printed for *E. Reyner*, in the Year, 1691.

VINDICATION

OF THE

Naked Gospel.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

THE Design of this Work is of no less Importance than to discover the Naked Truth, as far as 'tis possible, after the Destruction of such infinite Numbers of Volumes by the Barbarity of former Ages: The little Fragments and Gleanings whereof, (that accidentally escap'd the Flames and Fury of those Times) tho' dispers'd up and down, yet do still afford some Light to a perspicacious Enquirer; and indeed give such a Landskip of things, as the Ruins now at Athens, Carthage and Rome, do of those Majestick Cities. We may still plainly see, how the simple Primitive Chastity of the Gospel was defil'd with the Ceremonies, and the vain Philosophy of the Pagans: How Platonic Enthusiasm was impos'd upon the World for Faith, Mystery and Revelation, by cloyster'd Ecclesiasticks; Qui omnia quæ putabant Christianismo conducere, Biblijs interseruerunt, as any one may collect from Erasmus, Scaliger, Grotius, Cappellus, and F. Simons; who had compar'd Manuscripts. Their dogmatical Contradictions in Councils, their silly Quarrels, their frequent changes in Opinion, their childish trifling in Words, their Inconstancy, Pride, and other Passions are laid open, as the Source of publick

Troubles and common Calamities. We may justly lament with Joseph Scaliger *the cruel Suppression of the old Books that were in the hands of the* Fathers, *for if we had them now in our Libraries,* Nous verrions des belles choses, *says that Prodigy of Learning, who in another place complains,* Nihil fuit erga bonas literas injuriosius veteribus Christianis; si voluissent, haberemus tam præclara. —— *But considering how they handed things down to us,* Je ne me serois jamais Chrestien a lire les Peres, Ils ont tant de Fadaises. *Scalig.*

In our own time we have seen the same Phrenzy acted over again, Academick *Inquisitors (like supream infallible Tribunals) burning Articles and Books, afterwards embracing and practising the very same; expelling and recalling, canting and recanting, after the manners of their* Fore-fathers, *who veer'd about with every Wind, and were very angry that the Laity would not believe things against their Sense and Reason, as the Woman would have had her Husband against his own Eyes: What! Believe your Eyes before your own sweet Wife?*

The most considerable Parts of the present Vindication are, I. *The History of* Plato's *Trinity.* II. *The* Arian *Controversie.* III. *Of the* Nicene *Council.* IV. *Of the* Athanasian *Creed.* V. *Of the Quarrels and Divisions of the Churches*: Which take as follows.

A Modest and Historical

VINDICATION, &c.

THat this work may be clear and instructive, 'tis thought necessary to observe Method and Order of Time, which are the chief lights in Historical Controversies; Therefore we will begin with the most learned Bishop of the Primitive Church.

Eusebius was born in *Palestine*, and perhaps at *Cæsarea*; (a) for he says in the beginning of his Letter to the Christians of that City, *That he was there baptized, and instructed in the Christian Faith.* He was born towards the end of the third Century; though we cannot find exactly the year of his Birth. He began early to apply himself to Learning, especially to Divinity, as it sufficiently appears in his Writings, wherein may be seen, that he had carefully read all sorts of Books; and that all the Christian Writings, whether Greek or Latin, were well known to him. He had the advantage of the curious Library, which the Martyr *Pamphilius*, his particular Friend, had collected at *Cæsarea*. (b) It's affirm'd, That being become Bishop of this City, he entreated *Constantine*, (who passed through it, and who had bid him ask some favour in behalf of his Church) That he would permit him to make a search into all the

(a) *Ap. Socrat. lib.* v. c. 8.

(b) *Hieron. Ep. ad Chron. & Heliod. Antipater. Bostrensis in concil. Nicen.* 11. Act. 5.

publick

publick Regiſters, to extract the Names of all the Martyrs, and the time of their Death. However, he has committed Faults enough in Chronology, as *Joſeph Scaliger*, and a great many other learned Men have obſerved, and eſpecially in relation to Martyrs, as Mr. *Dodwel* has lately ſhewn in his Diſſertation, *de paucitate Martyrum*. But it was no eaſie matter to eſcape theſe kind of Faults in ſuch a work as his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which was the firſt of that ſort that was ever undertaken; the Primitive Chriſtians taking no care of the Hiſtory of their Times.

Euſebius, is commonly called the Son of *Pamphilius*; whether he was really his Son, as ſome affirm, or his Nephew, according to the opinion of others; or in fine, as moſt believe, by reaſon of the great Friendſhip between them. This *Pamphilius* was of *Beryte* in *Phenicia*, and Prieſt of *Cæſarea*; he held *Origen*'s Opinions, for whom he wrote an Apology, of which there remains to us, but a part of it, in Latin, among the Works of *Origen* and St. *Jerome*. He made it in Priſon, where he was put in the year 307. under the Emperour *Decius*, and where *Euſebius* did not forſake him. He could write only the firſt five Books, having been hindred from finiſhing (a) this Work, by the Death which he ſuffered for the Goſpel two years after he had been thrown into Priſon. But *Euſebius* finiſh'd it, in adding thereto a ſixth Book, and publiſh'd it after his Death. *Pamphilius* had for Maſter, *Pierius* (b) Prieſt of *Alexandria*, who likewiſe ſuffered Martyrdom, and was alſo of *Origen*'s Opinion, whoſe Aſſiduity and Eloquence he imitated, which got him the name of ſecond *Origen*. It's not amiſs here to relate the Judgment which *Photius* makes of his Works.

(a) *Photius, cod. CXVIII.*

(b) *Id. Cod. CXIX.*

He

He advances several Errors, says he, *remote from those which are at present established in the Church, perhaps according to the Custom of the Ancients: Yet he speaks after a pious manner of the Father and the Son, excepting that he assures us, They have two Essences,* (οὐσίας) *and two Natures,* (φύσεις) *using the words Essence and Nature, as it appears by what precedes, and follows in this Passage, for that of* Hypostasis, *and not in the sense of the* Arians. *But he speaks of the Holy Spirit in a dangerous manner, for he attributes to him, a Glory inferiour to that of the Father and the Son*; yet he was Catechist of *Alexandria* under the Patriarch *Theonas*, who was consecrated in the year 282.

Pamphilius being dead, as has been said, *Eusebius* retired to *Paulinus* Bishop of *Tyre*, his Friend; where he was witness, (a) as he tells us himself, of several Martyrdoms, the History of which he has left us, in his Book of *the Martyrs of* Palestine. From thence he went into *Egypt*, where he found the Persecution yet more violent, and where he was thrown into Prison. But this Persecution having ceased, he was set at Liberty, and a while after elected Bishop of *Cesarea*, after the death of *Agapius*. It's not certainly known in what year this Election was made, but at least, he was already Bishop, when *Paulinus* dedicated a stately Church in the City of *Tyre*, which he had built there, which was in the year 316, in the 10*th* year of *Constantin*'s Reign; for it was the custom of the Christians, (b) as well as of the Pagans, to consecrate their Churches in the time of the Decennales of the Emperours, or of any other Solemnity. *Eusebius* recites a fine Oration, spoken at this Dedication, (c) and tho' he does not say, that it was he himself

(a) *Lib.* 8. c. 7.

(b) *Ant. Diss. hypat. pan.* n. 11. c. 3. n. 12, 13.

(c) *Lib.* x. c. 4.

that ſpoke it, yet the ſtyle of this Oration, and the modeſt manner after which he mentions him that made it, gives one reaſon to believe, that he has ſuppreſs'd his name only through Modeſty. One might imagine, that he was then but Prieſt, were it not manifeſt, that it was very rare in that Age for Prieſts to ſpeak in publick, where there were *Biſhops* preſent.

It was about this time, that *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, had a bickering with one of his Prieſts named *Arius*, touching the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, which gave Birth to *Arianiſm*. *Euſebius* having had a great ſhare in the Diſputes of Arianiſm, we cannot recount his Life without writing the Hiſtory of it; and to know wherein conſiſted theſe Diſputes, we muſt neceſſarily aſcend higher, and enquire what Principles of Philoſophy were in uſe in that time among the Chriſtians, and how they came to be introduced. This is ſo neceſſary a Digreſſion, as will appear in the Sequel, that it's to be ſuppoſed, the Reader muſt approve of it.

There was never any Philoſopher that made himſelf ſo famous as *Plato*, and no Books read with more pleaſure than his, whether from the Subjects, and lofty Thoughts found therein, or by reaſon of the Elegancy and Nobleneſs of their Style, which never any Philoſopher could equalize. He was born under the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, Sirnam'd *Long-hand*, 426 years before Chriſt, and died aged fourſcore years, in the time when *Philip* of *Macedon* made himſelf to be fear'd of all *Greece*. *Alexander* his Son having made himſelf maſter of *Aſia*, which his Succeſſors divided among them; one may reaſonably believe, that the Sciences of the *Greeks* there, eſtabliſh'd themſelves with their Empire, and their Cuſtoms.

Ptolomy

Ptolemy the Son of *Lagus*, one of *Alexander*'s Succeſſors, undertook to collect into his Library of *Alexandria*, all the Books he could find, and drew thither ſeveral learned Men of *Greece*. (a) He was learned himſelf, and omitted nothing, for the inſpiring into his Sons the love of Learning.

(a) *Vid. Hody de 70. Int. c. 9.*

His Son *Philadelphus* march'd, in this reſpect, in his Fathers ſteps, as all thoſe who have any knowledge in the Hiſtory of this Prince, do well know. The *Syrian* Monarchs ſeem likewiſe to have cultivated the Sciences, ſeeing that *Suidas* relates, that *Euphorion* of *Chalcis* in *Eubœa*, Poet and Philoſopher, was Library-keeper of *Antiochus* the great, two hundred years before our Saviour's time. *Plato* was too famous then, and his Works in too great eſteem, not to have had Place in theſe Libraries. One may alſo believe, that *Aſia*, which was then full of Greek Philoſophers, wanted not *Platoniſts*.

Among the Opinions of *Plato*, there are not any more remarkable, than thoſe which he had touching the Divinity, the Præ-exiſtence and Immortality of the Soul. He held that there is only one Supream, Spiritual, and Inviſible God, whom he calls *The Being*, or, the *Being it ſelf*, the *very Being*, *The Father*, *and cauſe of all Beings*, &c. He placed under this ſupream God an inferiour Being, which he calls *Reaſon*, (λόγος) *The Director of things preſent and future*, *the Creator of the Univerſe*, &c. In fine, he acknowledged a third Being, which he calls the *Spirit* or *Soul* of the *World*. He added, That the firſt was the Father of the ſecond, and that the ſecond had produced the third. We may conſult hereupon his *Timæus*, to which we ſhould adjoyn his II. and VI. Letter. In the ſecond, which is directed to *Denys*, who complained, that *Plato* had

not

not ſufficiently inſtructed him touching the *firſt Nature*, or firſt Being, this Philoſopher thus expreſſes himſelf. *Every thing is about the King of all things, and every thing is becauſe of him; he is the cauſe of all good things: The things of the ſecond Order, are about the ſecond; the things of the third, are about the third.* He calls this a Riddle; forbids *Denys* to ſpeak of it before the ignorant; enjoyns him to burn his Letter as ſoon as he has read it, and proteſts he will never write again of this matter. In his ſixth Letter, he enjoyns *Hermias Eraſtus* and *Coriſca* to ſwear, in taking to witneſs, *the God who is the Director of things preſent and future, and the Lord, who is the Father of this Director and of this Cauſe.* The Obſcurity which he affects in this occaſion, leſt he ſhould draw on him the Rage of the Superſtitious Populace, hinders us from underſtanding what he would ſay, unleſs we collate together all the Paſſages wherein he ſpeaks of the Divinity, and conſult his Interpreters and Diſciples.

(a) *Hierocles de provid. apud Photium. Cod. CCLI.*

Here's how one of 'em *(a)* explains his his Maſters meaning: *Plato believed, that God the Creator ſuſtains the viſible and inviſible World, which was made out of nothing; That his Will ſuffices to make Beings exiſt; That by the conjunction of a corporal Nature, and another incorporal, he has made a moſt perfect World, which is double and ſingle at the ſame time, in which one may diſtinguiſh the high, the middle, and the low; That he calls high, the Heavenly Beings, and the Gods; The middle, the Æthereal Intelligences and good Demons, which are the Interpreters and Meſſengers, in what relates to the good of men; The low, the terreſtrial Intelligences, and the Souls of men, or men Immortal; That the ſuperiour Beings govern the inferiour, but that God who is the Creator and Father of 'em, reigns over all; and that this paternal Empire,*

Empire, is nothing else but his Providence, by which he gives to every sort of Being what belongs to it. We may hereby understand what *Plato* calls the things of the second and third Order. We shall not busie our selves in seeking from whom *Plato* might have learnt this Doctrin, whether from the *Caldeans*, or from the Old Testament, as some of the Fathers have believ'd.

Altho' *Plato*'s Disciples are agreed with their Master, in respect of these three Principles, yet there is to be found in their Writings divers Enquiries touching their nature, and divers ways of speaking, which are not to be seen in those of this Philosopher, who never dared to write all he thought on this subject. *Plotinus* particularly, who liv'd in the beginning of the third Century, has treated of them, in several places of his *Ennedes*, (a) but especially in the Book which is intitled *of the three Hypostases, which are the three Principles of all things.* Here's whereunto his Doctrin may be reduced. I. There are three Principles: *The Being*, *the Spirit*, or *the Reason of the Being*, and *the Soul of the World*, *which is the Reason of the Spirit.* There is also, according to him, *a Reason of the Soul of the World*, but it is a Reason *obscure*, (ἀμυδρὸς). II. The Being has begotten the Reason, not by an act of his will, or by a decree, but by his nature, as fire begets heat, or as the sun produces light. The Reason has also begotten the Soul of the World, and perhaps termed Father in this respect. III. These three Hypostases differ in number, altho' there be a most strict union between them; which makes, that one may say at the same time, that they are different, and that they are the same thing. The first is more excellent than the second, and the second more excellent

(a) *Præsertim En. V. lib. 1. a cap. 3 ad 8.*

cellent than the third. IV. The terms which *Plotinus* uſes, are worth obſerving. 1. He calls not only eſſence (οὐσία) after *Plato*, the nature of the being, of the reaſon and of the ſoul of the World, but he likewiſe uſes the word ὕλη, *matter*, and ſays, that the matter of the one is more perfect than that of the other. Having pretended that *Parmenides* had ſaid before *Plato*, that there are three Principles, he expreſſes himſelf in theſe terms: *Parmenides holds likewiſe the Opinion of the three Natures.* 2. It's obſervable, that the word *hypoſtaſis* (ὑπόστασις) ſignifies two things with this Philoſopher; firſt, the *exiſtence* of a thing, conſidered abſtractedly; and in the ſecond place, the thing it ſelf which exiſts, as it's taken in the Title of this Book, of *the three Hypoſtaſes*, which are the Principles of all things, περὶ τριῶν ἀρχικῶν ὑποστάσεων, and in the Title of the third Book of the ſame *Enneade*, of *intelligent Beings*. 3. As he ſays, That the Reaſon is the Father of the Soul, he ſays likewiſe, that the Reaſon *begets*, and *makes* the Soul; for we muſt obſerve, that in this matter, *Plato* and his Diſciples uſe indifferently the words, *to beget*, *to make*, *to produce*, &c. and that *begotten* and *made*, is the ſame thing here, in their mouths. We need only read *Plato*'s *Timæus*. 4. *Plotinus* ſays, that the Father and the Reaſon are *one and the ſame thing* ἕν, becauſe *they coexiſt and forſake not one another.* He ſays, that the Supream Being, and whoſe eſſence conſiſts *in exiſting*, in a manner wholly particular, has begotten by his Nature the Spirit, and that he cannot be without him, no more than a luminous body can be without light.

The Spirit on his part, whoſe eſſence conſiſts in having perpetually a lively conception of the Being, cannot exiſt (ὑφεστῶναι) without this. They cannot be ſepa-

ſeparated (χωρίζεται) one from the other, becauſe there is nothing between them, as there is nothing between the Spirit and the Soul. 5. He ſays, that that which is begotten, reſembles (ὁμοιοῦται) its cauſe juſt as the Light reſembles the Sun. 6. He ſays, that the Spirit is the Image (εἰκὼν, ἄγαλμα) of the Being, as the Soul is the Image of the Spirit.

St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, in his Eighth Book againſt *Julian*, cites a paſſage of *Porphyry*, out of his Third Book of the Philoſophical Hiſtory, whence it appears That the *Platoniſts* diſputed among themſelves, whether there could be more than three *Hypoſtaſes* in the Divinity; *Plato*, ſaith *Porphyry*, *has taught, that the Divine Eſſence may extend it ſelf even to three Hypoſtaſes; to wit, the Supream Divinity, or the good it ſelf; after it, the Creator, who is the ſecond; and the Soul of the World, which is the third*, &c. *But there are Men who pretend, that we muſt not reckon the very good, or good it ſelf, among the things which he has produced, and that being of a perfect ſimplicity, and incapable of accidents, he has communion with nothing: ſo that it is by the Spirit that we muſt begin to reckon the Trinity* τὴν τριάδα, *&c.*

However, *Porphyry*'s Maſter, whom we have already cited, ſeems (a) to ſay, that there may be more than three *Hypoſtaſes*, in theſe remarkable words:

(a) *Ennead. V. lib. 8. c. 12.*

God has begotten an excellent Being, and has brought forth all things in him. This production has coſt him no pain, for pleaſing himſelf in what he begat, and finding his productions good, he has retained them all in himſelf, tempering his brightneſs and theirs. Thoſe which have there remain'd being more excellent, there's only his only Son (τὸν υἱὸν) Jupiter *who has appear'd without, by whom,*

as by the supream Son of the Divinity, and as in an Image, one may see what the Father is, and the Brethren which have remained in the Father, παρὰ τῷ πατρι.

The *Platonists* likewise used, in speaking of the Union which they conceiv'd to be between the different Orders of their Divinities, the Terms of ἑτερούσιος, *of different Essence*, and ὁμοούσιος, *Co-essential*. By the first, they denote the different sorts of Beings, and by the second, what is of the same kind. Here's a Proof taken out of *Jamblichus*, in his Book of the Mysteries of the Egyptians, *Sect.* 1. *ch. xix.* He speaks of the manner after which the Superiour Gods are united to the Inferiour, according to the Platonic Philosophy: *The Divinities*, says he, *of the second Order, turning themselves towards the first intellectual Beings, and the first giving to the second, the same Essence,* (τὴν αὐτῆς οὐσίας) *and the same Power; this entertains their Union. What we call Union in the things which are of different kinds,* (ἑτεροειδῶν) *as the Soul and the Body, or which are divers Species,* (ἀνομοειδῶν) *as material things; or which are otherwise divided, this Union, I say, happens to 'em from superiour things, and destroys it self at a certain time. But the more we elevate our selves to superiour things, and to the Identity* (ταυτότητα) *of the first Beings, and in regard of the Species, and in regard of the Essence; when we ascend from the parts to the whole, the more we acknowledge the Union* (ἕνωσιν) *which is eternal, and the more we see what is the Union properly so called, and the Model whereon all the rest have been form'd, and that it hath about it, and in it self, the Diversity* (ἑτερότητα) *and the Multiplicity.*

Porphyry had ask'd, whether a kind of Being is form'd, (ὑποστάσεως) mixt with our Soul and Divine Inspiration, which made the Prophets able to foresee the future. *Jamblichus* (a) answer'd,

(a) Sect. 3. c. 21.

ſwer'd, *no*; and gives this reaſon for it; *which is, that when one only thing is form'd of two, the whole is of one and the ſame Species, of the ſame Nature, and Co eſſential,* (ὁμοούσιον) *and that this does not happen in the caſe propoſed by Porphyry.*

One may ſee hereby, the Subtilty with which the *Platoniſts* handled theſe Matters, and the Terms they uſed. But we ſhould take notice of two things, in endeavouring to form to our ſelves an Idea of their Sentiments. The firſt, that we muſt not always ſuppoſe they had a clear and diſtinct knowledge of what they would ſay themſelves, and that they ſaw all the conſequences of their Opinions: So that it would be perhaps in vain, to endeavour to draw out of their Writings a clear Idea of their Sentiment, touching the three Principles of all things, becauſe, perhaps they themſelves conceiv'd not clearly what they ſaid; at leaſt, their Style is ſo different on this Occaſion, from that which is obſervable in the Paſſages of their Writings, wherein they ſpeak of things which they may know, that it is apparent, they contain'd not the ſubject of the three Principles, like an infinite of others, which they have known how to expreſs in an even, clear, and elegant manner. The ſecond thing we ſhould obſerve, is, That in ſo difficult a matter, we muſt content our ſelves with what they ſay poſitively, without attempting to draw far-fetch'd Conſequences from their Principles, which we cannot underſtand but by halfs; otherwiſe we are in danger of attributing to them, ſuch Notions as they never had. Neither muſt we endeavour to reconcile in ſo abſtracted a ſubject, the contradictions which ſeem to appear in their Doctrin, nor conclude, that they could not mean things in ſuch a manner, becauſe then they muſt contradict themſelves. It was the cuſtom of theſe

Philosophers to affect certain apparent Contradictions in using the same Terms in divers Senses. Besides, 'tis obvious enough to imagine, that they may have sometimes contradicted themselves, on a subject whereof they had no distinct Idea.

These two Remarks were necessary to prevent the questions which might be offer'd on these matters, and to shew that in writing the History of these Doctrins, one should keep wholly to Facts, and the Terms of the Authors we treat of.

A second Opinion of the *Platonists*, which has made a great noise in the World, is that of the Præ existence of Souls, in places above the Moon, (*b*) of the faults which they may have there committed, of their banishment from these happy Abodes, to come to inhabit in differently disposed Bodies, according to the different merits of these Souls; in fine, of their return into places whence they drew their Original. We shall not trouble our selves to explain this Doctrin, because it belongs not to the Relation in hand, having only made mention of it, for a particular Reason which will appear in its Place.

(*b*) *Vid. Plato's Timæus.*

The Kings of *Egypt* and *Syria*, having carried the Sciences of the *Greeks* into *Asia*, the *Jews*, who were in great numbers in these two Kingdoms, and who were oblig'd to converse with them, learnt of them their Opinions; and made no difficulty of embracing those, which did not appear to 'em contrary to their Religion. Their Books containing nothing inconsistent with sundry of the Platonic Doctrins; they believ'd therefore, that these Doctrins might be true, and receiv'd them so much the more easily, in that they thought, they might hereby defend their Religion against the *Pagans*, and make them relish it the better. *Plato* every where affirm'd the Unity of the supream Being,

Beings, yet without denying that there are other Beings, which may be called *Gods*, to wit, the Angels, which is agreeable to the Expressions of the Old Testament. And this is apparently one of the things which made the *Jews* better relish the Opinions of this Philosopher.

But we should give some particular Proofs of this. The Author of the Book of the *Wisdom of Solomon*, was plainly of the Opinion of the Pre-existence of Souls, as it appears from these Words of the viii *Ch.* 19. & 20 verses, *For I was a witty Child, and had a good Spirit. Yea, rather being good, I came into a Body undefiled.* The same Author has used the Word, *Reason*, in some places, where *Plato* would have used it, were he to have said the same thing. Thus in the 18 *Ch.* 15, 16, v. in speaking of the Deliverer of the *Israelites*, he says, *Thy Almighty Reason descended from Heaven, out of thy Royal Throne, as a fierce Man of War into the midst of a Land of Destruction, and brought thine unfeigned Commandment, as a sharp Sword, and standing up, filled all things with Death; and it touched the Heav'n, but it stood upon the Earth.* In the ix *Ch.* 1 *v.* He says, *that God has made all things by his Reason.* It cannot be alledg'd that he has been the only one of the *Jews* that has spoke in this manner, seeing that *Philo*, who liv'd a little while after our Saviour, is full of the like Expressions, as several of the learned have observ'd. It's known, that this Author has so well imitated *Plato*, that he has been call'd the *Jewish Plato*. He believ'd that there was one only supream God, as all the rest of the *Jews* do, whom he calls, ΤΟ ΟΝ, the being through Excellency; But he farther acknowledged a Divine Nature, which he calls ΛΟΓΟΣ, the Reason, as well as *Plato*; and another whom he calls likewise the *Soul of the World*. His

Writings

Writings are so full of these manners of speaking, that there is no need of offering Instances.

The *Jews* were of these Opinions when our Saviour and his Apostles came into the World; and this is perhaps the Reason why we find, accordingly as it has been observ'd by several learned Men, several Platonic Phrases in the New Testament, especially in the Gospel of St. *John*.

It's well known, that *Amelius* the Platonic Philosopher, having read the beginning of this Gospel, remarked, that this Apostle spake like *Plato*. In effect, this Philosopher might have said, according to his Principles, *The Reason was in the beginning with God, and was God: She it is who hath made all things, who is life, and the light of Men*, &c. We find several Passages in *Philo*, like to this. This Jewish Philosopher calls Reason, the Priest, the Mediator between God and Men, the eldest Son of God, &c. wherein it is observable, that he mixes his Jewish Notions, with the manners of speaking of *Plato*. He has likewise used in one Place the Term, *Paraclete*, (*a*) Intercessour, in speaking of the Reason: *It was necessary*, said he, *that the High Priest who is to offer Sacrifices to the Father of the World should have for Intercessour him of his Sons, whose Vertue is the most perfect, for to obtain the pardon of Sins, and abundant Graces.* He had said, (*b*) that *Moses* denoted by the *Manna*, and by the *Rock* of the Desert, the same Reason: *The Prophet*, says he, *calls elsewhere this Rock Manna, a name which signifies the same thing, to wit, the Divine Reason, the most ancient of Beings.* Our Saviour Christ calls himself in St. John, *Paraclete*, ch. xiv. 16. when he promises his Apostles to send them *another Paraclete*; he says likewise, that he is the *true Bread*,

(*a*) De Vit. Mos. p. 521. Edit. Gen. Gract. Lat

(*b*) Quod det. pot. insid. 2. 137.

Bread, in opposition to the Manna, which cou'd be no more than a shadow of it; and St. *Paul* says, That the Stone of the Desert was *Christ*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 4. These ways of speaking which are found in St. *John*, *I am the true Bread, the true Vine*, and which denote, that he to whom they are applied, is able to produce in mens Spirits as much efficacy, in another kind of things, as the Bread and Wine produce in the Body; these ways of speaking, I say, were particular to the Platonists, as has been observed elsewhere.

We might give several other Examples of Platonic Phrases, to be met with in the New Testament; but it will be sufficient to remark here, that the Apostles apply to our Savior Christ Passages of the Old Testament, which *Philo* had applied to the Reason, and that this Jewish Philosopher has giv'n to this same Reason most of the Titles which the Apostles have giv'n to Jesus Christ.

The *Pagans*, who had then embraced the Gospel, and who were in some measure vers'd in the Heathen Philosophy, remarking this resemblance of Terms, perswaded themselves, that the Apostles believ'd the same things, in respect of these matters, as the Platonic *Jews* and *Pagans*. And this seems to be that which drew several Philosophers of this Sect into the Christian Religion, and giv'n such a great esteem to the Primitive Christians, for *Plato*. *Justin Martyr*, in his first Apology, says, that (a) *Jesus Christ was known in part by* Socrates; *for the Reason was and is still the same, which is in every man. It is She that has foretold the future by the Prophets, and who being become subject to the same Infirmities as we, has instructed us by her self.* He says,

(a) P. 48. Ed. Col. An. 1686.

says moreover, (b) *That the Opinions of Plato, are not remote from those of Jesus Christ.* And this has made likewise St. *Austin* to say, *That if the ancient Platonists were such as they were described, and were to rise again, they would freely embrace Christianity, in changing* (c) *some few Words and Opinions*, which most of the late Platonists, and those of his time have done, *paucis mutatis verbis atq; sententiis, Christiani fierent, sicut pleriq; recentiorum, nostrorumq; temporum Platonici fecerunt. Tertullian* affirms in his Apology, (a) that when the Christians say, That *God has made the Universe by his Word, by his Reason, and by his Power, they speak only after the sage Heathens, who tell us, That God has made the World by his* (λόγος) *Word or Reason. Clement Alexandrin* has likewise believ'd, that *Plato* held the Doctrin of the blessed Trinity. *Origen* against *Celsus* does not deny, but that *Plato* spake the truth, in speaking of God, (b) and of his Son; he only maintains, that he did not make such a just use as he ought of his Knowledge. He does not say, that the Foundation of the Christian Doctrin is different in this from that of *Plato*, but that this Philosopher had learnt it from the Jews. *Constantin*, in his harangue to the Saints, (c) after having prais'd *Plato*, in that he was the first Philosopher, who brought men to the contemplation of intellectual things, thus goes on: *He has spoken of a first God, who is above all Essences, wherein he has done well. He has likewise submitted to him a Second, and has distinguisht two Essences in number,* (δύο τοίας καὶ ἀριθμῷ διῆλε) *the Perfection of the one being the same as that of the other, and the Essence of the second God taking his*

(b) P. 51. E. jes. ed.

(c) De Ver. Rel. c. 3. Vid. & Ep. LVI.

(a) C. XXI.

(b) Lib. 6. p. 276, & 280.

(c) Cap. IX.

his Existence from the first. For it is he who is the Author, and the Director of all things, being above all. He that is after him, having executed his Orders, attributes to him, as to the supream cause, the production of the Universe. There is then but one, to speak properly, who takes care and provides for all, to wit, the Reason, who is God, and who has set all things in their order. This Reason being God, is likewise the Son of God; for who can call him otherwise, without committing a great fault? He that is the Father of all things, is justly said to be the Father of his own proper Reason. HITHERTO *PLATO* HAS SPOKE LIKE A WISE MAN, (μέχρι μὲν οὖν τούτε Πλάτων σώφρων ἦν) *but he has varied from the truth, in introducing a multiplicity of Gods, and in giving to each of 'em his form.* We might cite several other such like Passages, whereby one might see, that several among the Fathers of the first three Centuries have believ'd, that the Opinion of *Plato* and that of the Apostles was the same.

If we consider, that the Question here is about things of which we have naturally no *Idea*, and which is even incomprehensible, supposing revelation; and of which one can only speak in metaphorical and improper Language, it will then appear to us no wonder, if since the Apostles times, there have arose several Opinions on this Subject. Thus the *Ebionites* are charged, to have denied the Præ-existence of our Savior's Divinity, and to have held, that he was only a meer Man. These *Ebionites* have remain'd a long time, seeing that not only *Justin Martyr* and St. *Irenæus* do mention them, but St. *Jerom* seems to take notice, that they were in his time. It's affirm'd, That *Artemon*, under the Emperor *Severus* and *Paulus Samosatenus* Bishop of *Antioch* un-

der the Emperor *Aurelius*, maintain'd the ſame Opinions. *Cerinthus*, on the contrary, held the Præ-exiſtence of the Reaſon, which he call'd the *Chriſt*, and affirm'd, that ſhe had deſcended on Jeſus, in the form of a Dove, when he was Baptiz'd, and that ſhe aſcended up into Heaven, when he was crucifi'd. It is indeed very difficult to affirm, that this was preciſely the Opinions of theſe Hereticks, becauſe we have nothing remaining to us of them, and that we cannot fully truſt thoſe who ſpeak of 'em only with deteſtation, ſeeing it might eaſily be, that their great Zeal has hindred them from well comprehending them. And this is a Remark which we muſt make in reſpect of all the ancient Hereticks, whoſe Opinions are denoted to us only from the Writings of their Adverſaries.

About the middle of the third Century, *Sabellius* produced a new Opinion, which was condemned in *Egypt*, and afterwards every where. He was charg'd with (a) *confounding the Hypoſtaſis, and denying the Properties* which diſtinguiſh the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and for having ſaid, *that the Father is the ſame as the Son.* Whereas *Plato* and his followers reckoned three numerical Eſſences. It ſeems, that *Sabellius* wou'd acknowledge but one, whom he call'd the Father, the Son, or Holy Spirit in divers regards. It's ſaid, that ſome others had maintain'd the ſame thing before and after him, as *Noet* and *Beryllus* of *Boſtra*.

(a) *Synod. Conſt. ap Theod. lib. 5. c. 9. Damaſcen apud eundem, c. 11.*

A while after *Sabellius*, appear'd *Paulus Samoſatenus*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, who was, as we have ſaid, of the *Ebionites* Sentiment, in relation to our Savior's Divinity. Altho' the word ὁμοούσιος had been uſed in the Platonic Philoſophy, to ſignifie what is of the

ſame

same kind, as has been observ'd already, and as may be seen in *Bull's Defence*. Nicene Council, *Sect.* 2. *ch.* 1. Yet the Council which met at *Antioch*, to condemn *Paul* of *Samosatia*, condemn'd likewise this term. But it's hard to find in what sense it was taken, because the Acts of this Council are lost, and we know nothing of them, but by what St. *Athanasius* and some others extreamly interessed to uphold this word, have said in their Disputes against the *Arians*. If we believe them, the Fathers of the Council of *Antioch* said, that the Father and the Son were not *consubstantial*, in the same sense wherein we say, that two pieces of Mony made of the same Metal are *consubstantial*, because that these pieces suppose a præexistent matter, of which they have been both form'd; whereas the Father and the Son do not suppose the like substance. *Paulus Somosatenus* said, that if the Son had not been made God, we must suppose, that he is of the same kind of essence as that of the Father; and that thus there must have been an anterior substance to the one and to the other, of which they must have been form'd. St. *Athanasius* assures us, (a) that the term of *homoousios* was condemn'd at *Antioch*, in as much only as it might include the *Idea* of a matter anterior to things which we call *coessentials*

(a) In *lib. de Syn. Arim.* &c. *Seleut. II. p.* 919. *Seq.*

These are the chief heretical Opinions, touching the Divinity of Jesus Christ, which appear'd before the Council of *Nice*. As for the Fathers, which are respected as Orthodox, they have not varied from the Expressions of the *Platonists*; and as these have sometimes said, that the Reason is different from the Supream Being, and sometimes, that they are both one: The Fathers have exprest themselves in the

ſame Terms. The *Platoniſts* have ſaid, That the Father could not be without the Son, nor the Son without the Father; as the Light could not be without the Sun, nor the Sun without Light; and the Fathers have ſaid the ſame thing. Both one and the other have acknowledged, that the Reaſon has exiſted before the World, and that ſhe has produced it; and as *Plato* ſpeaks in his *Timæus*, and *Plotinus* in his *Enneades* of the Generation of Reaſon, as if the good it ſelf had produced it, to create and govern the World: So the Fathers have ſaid, that the Son hath proceeded in ſome manner from the Father, before the Creation of the World, to manifeſt himſelf to men by his Production, and that hence it is, that the Scripture calls him the *Son of God*, and his *Firſt born*.

Sometimes they ſay, there was a time in which the Son was not; ſometimes, that he was from Everlaſting as well as the Father; ſometimes they affirm, they are equal; and elſewhere they ſay, the Father is greateſt. Some of 'em believe, that the Father and Son *are two Hypoſtaſes, two Natures, two Eſſences*, as appears from the Paſſage of *Pierius*, related by (*a*) *Photius*; others deny it. To bring Inſtances of all this, would be too great an Enlargement for this Place; and there being enough to be ſeen in *Bulls* Book, which we have already cited.

(*a*) *Cod. CXIX.*

If it be demanded at preſent, what Ideas they fixt to theſe Expreſſions, it cannot be affirm'd that they have been clear: Firſt, becauſe whatever endeavours are uſed to underſtand what they ſay, a man can get no diſtinct Notion thereof; and ſecondly, becauſe they acknowledge themſelves, that it is a thing incomprehenſible. All that can be done on this occaſion, is to relate the Terms which they have uſed, to the end, that it may be ſeen, how they have heretofore expreſs'd

preſs'd themſelves on this matter. However, learned Men have given themſelves a great deal of trouble to explain the Paſſages of the Fathers, who liv'd before the Council of *Nice*, without conſidering, that all their Explications are fruitleſs, ſeeing the Fathers, in acknowledging that what they ſaid was incomprehenſible, acknowledged at the ſame time, that they fix'd no Idea on the Terms they uſed, unleſs ſuch as were general and confuſed.

Had the matter ſtaid here, there had never been ſuch great Diſputes on the Sentiments of the Ancients, touching this Myſtery, ſeeing the Diſpute doth not ſo much lie on the Terms they have uſed, as the Ideas they have faſtned to them, which cannot be reduced to any thing that is clear. Sometimes they uſe Terms, which ſeem perfectly to agree with thoſe which have been uſed ſince; but there is found in ſome other places of their Works, Expreſſions which ſeem to overthrow what they had ſaid, ſo that one cannot form any Notion of what they thought. *Lactantius*, for Example, anſwers thus to the Heathens, who ask'd the Chriſtians, how they ſaid they acknowledged but one God, ſeeing they gave this Name to the Father, and to the Son? (a) *When we call the Father God, and the Son God, we do not ſay, that each of them is a different God; and we do not ſeparate them; becauſe the Father cannot be without the Son, nor the Son ſeparated from the Father: He cannot be called Father, without his Son, nor the Son be begotten without his Father. Seeing then that the Father makes the Son, and that the Son is made, the one and the other has the ſame Intellect, one only Spirit, and one only Subſtance*; UNA UTRIQUE MENS, UNUS SPIRITUS, UNA SUBSTANTIA. Theſe are Words which ſeem to be deciſive;

(a) *Inſtit. lib. 4. cap. 29. pag. 403. Ed. Oxon.*

decisive; and had *Lactantius* held to these Expressions, he had never been accused of Heterodoxy; but if he be question'd what he means by the Word *Unus*, whether it be a *Numerical Unity*, or an *Unity of Consent and Resemblance*, he will appear determin'd to this latter Sense: (a) *When any one*, says he, *has a Son whom he dearly loves, and who dwells in the House, and under the governing Power of his Father, although the Father grants him the Name and Authority of a Master; yet in the Terms of Civilians, here is but one House and one Master. So this World is but one House belonging to God, and the Son and the Father who inhabit the World, and who are of one Mind, (*Unanimes*) are one only God, the one being as the two, and the two as the one. And this ought not to appear strange, seeing the Son is in the Father, because the Father loveth the Son, and the Father is in the Son, by reason of his faithful Resignation to his Fathers Will; and that he does nothing, nor ever did do any thing, unless what the Father has will'd, or commanded him.* We may read farther, the vi. Ch. of the iv. Book, which begins thus: *God who has conceiv'd and produced all Things, before he began this curious work of the World, begat a Spirit Holy and Incorruptible, that he might call him his Son. Although he has produced infinite others, whom we call Angels, for his Ministry, yet has he vouchsafed to give the Name of Son to his only First-born, who is cloathed with the Vertue and Majesty of his Father.* That which is particular in this, is, that though *Lactantius* says, that the Son is Co-eternal with the Father, yet he says, there was a time when he was not. (a) *Sicut mater sine exemplo genuit auctorem suum; sic ineffabiliter Pater genuisse credendus est Co æternum. De Matre natus est qui ante jam fuit; de Patre qui*

(a) *Ib. p. 404.*

(a) *Lib. 2. c. 9. in Ed. Bejulcij.*

qui aliquando non fuit. Hoc fides credat, intelligentia non requirat, ne aut non inventum putet incredibile, aut repertum non credat ſingulare. It's true, this Paſſage is not to be found in ſome Manuſcripts, and that ſeveral learned men have fancied, that ſome ſly Heretick has corrupted *Lactantius* Works: but in other places, wherein all the Manuſcripts do agree, *Lactantius* expreſſes himſelf after the ſame manner; and it may be replied with as much likelihood, that it has been the Orthodox Reviſors who have cut off what they thought not fit to be made publick. *Lactantius* has been long ſince charg'd with Heterodoxy; but in this reſpect, he has been no more faulty than other Fathers, who liv'd before the Council of *Nice*, whoſe Expreſſions are as different as thoſe of the *Platoniſts*, in matter of the Trinity. And this has made Father *Petau* and Mr. *Huet*, to charge them with favoring the *Arian* Sentiments, whilſt other learned Men have maintain'd, that they have been far from them. Each of them cites his Paſſages, which examin'd a-part, ſeem to decide for him: But when one comes to compare theſe Paſſages with one another; it cannot be comprehended how the ſame Perſons could ſpeak ſo differently. In this Compariſon, their Expreſſions are found ſo obſcure, and ſo full of apparent Contradictions, or real ones, that a man feels himſelf oblig'd to believe, That the Fathers had done a great deal better in keeping themſelves to the Terms of the Apoſtles, and to have acknowledged, that they underſtood them not, than to throw themſelves into ſuch Labyrinths, by endeavouring to explain them.

To ſhew farther, that the Expreſſions of the Fathers are only fit to produce confuſed Notions, and ſuch as are contrary to thoſe, which all Chriſtians at this day hold; we need only read *Tertullian*, who having

having ſaid in his Apology, *Ch.* xxi. That the Nature of Reaſon is ſpiritual; adds, *Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, & prolatione Generatum, & idcirco Filium, & Deum dictum ex unitate ſubſtantiæ, nam & Deus Spiritus eſt*: But what means *Prolatum genitus*? The Terms of *Unity of Subſtance*, may ſignifie, not only of the ſame Subſtance *in Number*, but moreover, of a like Subſtance, that is to ſay, ſpiritual and equally perfect: And what he adds, ſeems to favour this laſt ſenſe; *Etiam cum radius ex ſole porrigitur, portio ex ſumma, ſed Sol erit in radio, quia Solis eſt radius; nec ſeparatur ſubſtantia, ſed extenditur.* The ſubſtance of a Ray, after what manner ſoever we conceive it, is not the ſame *in Number* as that of the Sun; and *Tertullian* ſays, that it is the ſame of the Son. *Ita de Spiritu Spiritus, & de Deo Deus*; Thus a Spirit is born of a Spirit, and a God of a God. *Ut Lumen de lumine accenditur, manet integra, & indefecta materiæ matrix, etſi plures inde traduces qualitatum mutueris*; as when we light one Torch by another, the Light which has lighted the other, remains entire and without being waſted, although we light ſeveral Torches, who have the ſame qualities. *Ita & quod de Deo profectum eſt, Deus eſt, & Dei filius & unus ambo. Ita de Spiritu Spiritus, & de Deo Deus modulo alternum numerum gradu, non ſtatu fecit, & à matrice non receſſit, ſed exceſſit*: So what proceeds from God is God, and Son of God, and both are but one; ſo the Spirit which is born of a Spirit, and the God who is born of a God, makes two in reſpect of Degree, but not in reſpect of his State; he has not been ſeparated from the Womb, or from his Original, but is gone out of it.

Those Words of *Tertullian*, do not appear at first sight agreeable with *Arius*'s Opinion; but at most they contain nothing that is clear, for one might have demanded of *Tertullian*, whether by this *Prolation* he speaks of, the Reason has existed as Light from a Torch, lighted by another Torch exists, as soon as it is lighted? Should he allow it, he might have been told, that to speak strictly, there must then have been two Gods, seeing that, in fine, two Spirits, though exactly equal, and strictly united, are two Spirits. If this be so, the second Spirit being not form'd of the same numerical Substance, as that of the first, one might say with *Arius*, that he has been *extracted from nothing*; and there would be in this regard, nothing but a Dispute about Words, between *Arius* and *Tertullian*. But if it be answer'd for *Tertullian*, that his comparison is not good, it will be ask'd, why he made use of a comparison which may lead into Errour, especially having said before, that he was of *Plato*'s opinion touching the Reason? If he meant, that the Father has produced in his proper Substance, without multiplying it, a *Modification*, in respect of which, one may call the Substance of the Father, Son; why does he say, *Spiritus ex Spiritu, ex Deo, Deus*? For to speak properly, the Father has produced neither a Spirit, nor a God, but a new manner of being in his proper Substance.

It is farther to be observed, that this Comparison is not of *Tertullian* alone, but of *Justin Martyr*, and a great number of Fathers besides, before and after the Council of *Nice*; and that there is no Passage which appears of greater force than that, yet the Equivocation of it is apparent.

The Fathers have likewise used the Term *Hypostasis*, as well as the *Platonists*, in two senses; some-

 times

times for the Existence taken in an abstracted manner, and sometimes for the thing it self, which exists. The Equivocation of this Term, and that of the Words, *One and Many*, which, as has been shew'd, are taken sometimes, from the Unity, and the Plurality *Specificall*, and sometimes from the Unity and Plurality *Numericall*, have caus'd great Controversies among the Fathers, as divers learned Men have (a) observ'd. But it is fit we should take notice of one thing, which is, that *Bull* who has writ Prolixly on this matter, has not a word of the *Numerical* and *Specific Unity*; without which, a man cannot comprehend what the Fathers mean, nor draw any Conclusions from them against the Hereticks. Yet when they say there are *three Hypostases*, or *three Essences*, or *three Natures*, he constantly takes it as if they said, there are three Modifications in one only Numerical Essence. He supposes, that the *one Essence*, and *own Nature*, signifie manners of existing of one Numerical Essence, only because that without this, those who have thus spoken of it, would not have been Orthodox, or of the Opinion at present receiv'd, which the Council must have approv'd of, seeing otherwise it would not have been admitted as it is. He supposes on the contrary, for the same Reasons, that when the Fathers deny there are three *Hypostases*, they do not barely mean, that there are not three Essences of different kinds, but that there are not three in number. But others will deny there is any place, where the Words *Nature* and *Essence* can be taken for what we at this day call *Personality*, which is to say, for a Modification; and that it appears from the Passages which he cites, that the Fathers held the *Numerical Unity*.

(a) *Petavius, Curcellæus, Huetius*, &c.

And

And this was the condition of the Christian Church, when the quarrels of *Arius* disturb'd it; Whence may be seen, that it was no hard matter for the two Parties to cite Authorities of the Ancients, whose Equivocal Expressions might be interpreted in divers Senses. The Obscurity of the Subject, the vain Subtilty of humane Understanding, which would know every thing, the Desire of appearing able, and the Passion which mingles it self in all Disputes, gave Birth to these Controversies, which for a long time tore Christianity into pieces.

Arius being a Priest of *Alexandria*, about the year 318, undertook, as it seems, to explain more clearly, the Doctrin of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, which had been till that time taught in the Christian Church, under the Veil of those Terms which we have recited. He said, that to *beget* in this Subject, was nothing else but to *produce*; whence he concluded, that the Divinity of Jesus Christ had been extracted out of nothing by the Father. Here's how he expresses himself, in a Letter which he wrote to *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*: *We make Profession to* (a) *believe, that the Son is not without Generation, and that he is not a part of that which is unbegotten, nor of any other Pre existent matter whatever; but that by the Will and Council* (of God) *he has been perfect God,* (ὑπέσκη θεὸς) *before all Time and Ages; that he is his only Son, and that he is not subject to change; that before he was begotten or created, he was not.* *Arius* was counted an able Logician, (b) and was in good esteem with his Bishop *Alexander*; but speaking freely his mind, he drew on him the hatred of one *Melece* (c) Bishop in *Thebaida*, who had caus'd a Schism in *Egypt*, although he did

(a) *Ap. Theod. lib. 1. cap. 5.*

(b) *Sozom. lib. 1. c. 15.*

(c) *Epiphan. in Hær. LXIX.*

not

not much vary from the common Opinions, only because he would not receive into Communion the Priests who had fall'n in the *Diocletian* Persecution, but after a long Pennance, and would have them for ever depriv'd of their Office.

One may say, the History of this in St. *Epiphanius*, who accuses him for having an affected Devotion, and taking up a particular way of living to make himself admired by the People. *Arius* had moreover another Enemy, named *Alexander*, and Sirnamed (a) *Baucalas*, who was also an associate Priest with him. He joyned himself to *Melece*, to complain to the Bishop of *Alexandria*, that *Arius* sowed a new Doctrin touching the Divinity of our Saviour Christ. He could the better spread his Opinions, in that having a particular Church at *Alexandria* committed to his Care, He preach'd there what he thought fit. (b) He drew such a great number of People into his Opinions, that there were 700 Religious Votaries who had embraced them, and consequently, a greater number among the ordinary People. It's said, that he was a man of large shape, of a severe Countenance, yet of a very agreeable Conversation.

(a) *Philost. lib. 1. c. 4.*

(b) *Epiph. Serm.*

Alexander thought, that in a matter wherein one might easily equivocate, it were best to let the two Parties explain themselves, to the end it might appear, that he had accorded them more by Perswasion than Force. He brought the two Parties to a Conference, in demanding of them, the Explication of a Passage of Scripture, in the Presence of the Clergy of his Church; but neither one nor the other of these Parties would yield, endeavouring only to vanquish. *Arius* his Adversaries maintained, that the Son is of

the

the ſame eſſence (ὁμοούσιον) as the Father, and that he is eternal as he is; and *Arius* pretended that the generation denoted a beginning. There was another meeting called, as fruitleſs as the firſt, in reſpect of the diſpute; but by which it ſeems *Alexander*, who had before not any preciſe determined ſentiment on this matter, was induced to embrace the opinion of *Arius* his adverſaries. He afterwards commanded this Prieſt *to believe* the ſame thing (ὁμοίως φρονεῖν ἐκέλευσεν) and to abandon the oppoſite opinion.

But it being ſeldom known that Men yield obedience to theſe kind of Injunctions, *Arius* remained ſtill in the ſame opinion, as well as ſeveral other Biſhops and Eccleſiaſtics who had approved of it. *Alexander* angry at his not being obey'd, excommunicated him, with all thoſe of his party, and oblig'd him to depart out of *Alexandria*. There were among others, five Prieſts of this City, and as many Deacons of the ſame Church, beſides ſome Biſhops of *Egypt*, as *Secundus* and *Theonas*, To them were joyned a great number of People, ſome of which did in effect approve the doctrin of *Arius*, and others thought that he had been condemned with too high an hand, without entring into the diſcuſſion of the controverſy. After this ſeverity, the two Parties endeavoured to make their opinions and conduct be approved by Letters which they ſent every where. They expoſed not only their reaſons, but endeavoured to render odious the oppoſite Party, by the conſequences they drew from their opinions, and in attributing to them ſtrange expreſſions. Some Biſhops, as *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, exhorted *Alexander* to reconcile himſelf with *Arius*; and others approv'd his Conduct, and adviſed him not to receive him into communion till he retracted. The

letters

letters of *Alexander* and *Arius* are too considerable to be disregarded; Here's then the sum of them.

Arius wrote to (a) *Eusebius* of "*Nicomedia*, to entreat his Protection against *Alexander* who had excommunicated him and driven him out of *Alexandria*, because he could not grant him, that the Father and the Son are coeternal; that the Son coexists with the Father without generation, having been always begotten, and not begotten at the same time, without letting it be imagined that the Father has existed so much as one moment before the Son. He added, that *Eusebius* Bishop of *Cesarea*, *Theodotus* of *Laodicea*, *Paulinus* of *Tyre*, *Athanasius* of *Anazarba*, *Gregory* of *Beryta*, and *Ætius* of *Lydia*, condemning the sentiments of *Alexander*, had been likewise struck with an Anathema, as well as all the eastern People who were of the same opinions, except *Philogonius* Bishop of *Antioch*, *Hellanicus* of *Tripoly*, and *Macarius* of *Jerusalem*, one of which said that the Son "was an *Eructation*, the other a *Projection*, and the other that he was not begotten, no more than the Father. To this *Arius* added the explanation of his opinion, which we have already related.

(a) ap. Epiph. in Hes. LXIX. & Theodor. lib. 1. C. 5.

The Bishop (a) of *Nicomedia* having receiv'd this Letter call'd a Synod of his province of *Bythinia*, which wrote circular Letters to all the Eastern Bishops to induce them to receive *Arius* into communion, as mantaining the truth, and to engage *Alexander* to do as much. We have still a Letter of *Eusebius* to *Paulinus* Bishop of *Tyre*, wherein he not only entreats *Paulinus* to intercede for *Arius*; but wherein he expoſes and defends his sentiments with great clearness. He says *he has never*

(a) Sozom. II.

never heard there were two Beings without Generation, nor that the one has been parted into two, but that this single Being had begotten another, not of his Substance, but perfectly like to him, although of a different Nature and Power; That not only we cannot express by Words the beginning of the Son, but that it is even incomprehensible to those intellectual Beings, which are above men, as well as to us. To prove this, he cites the 8th *of the* Proverbs, God the Lord possess'd me in the beginning of his Ways, before his Works of old, I was set up from Everlasting, and he has begotten me before the Mountains were brought forth. *He says, that we must not search into the Term of* Begetting *any other Signification than that of* Producing, *because the Scripture does not only use it in Reference to the Son, but moreover, in speaking of Creatures*; as when God says, I have begotten Children; and I have brought them up, but they have rebelled against me.

But these Letters not having had the Success which *Arius* expected, he sent to get leave of *Paulinus*, of *Eusebius*, and *Patrophilus* Bishop of *Scythopolis*, to gather those who were of his Opinion into a Church, and to exercise among them the Office of a Priest, as he was want to do before, and as was done at *Alexandria*. These Bishops having Convocated the other Bishops of *Palestine*, granted him what he demanded, but ordered him however to remain subject to *Alexander*, and to omit nothing to obtain Communion with him.

There is extant a Letter of *Arius*, directed to this Bishop, (a) and written from *Nicodemia*, which contains a Confession of Faith, according to the Doctrin which *Arius* affirm'd that *Alexander* himself had taught him; wherein, after having denoted his Belief touching the Father

(a) *Apud Epiph. H.*

ther, which includes nothing Heterodox; he adds, *That he hath begotten his only Son before the times Eternal; that it is by him, that he has made the World; that he has begotten him, not only in Appearance, but in Reality; that this Son ſubſiſts by his own Will; that he is unmoveable; that he is a Creature of God that is perfect, and not as other Creatures; that he is a Production, but not as other Productions; nor as* Valentinian *ſaid, a* Projection *of the Father; nor as* Manes *affirm'd, a* Conſubſtantial Part *of the Father; nor as* Sabellius *called him, a* Son Father; (υἱοπάτορα) *nor as* Hieracas *ſpake, a Lamp lighted by a Lamp, or a Torch divided into two; That he did not exiſt before he was begotten, and became a Son; that there are three* Hypoſtaſes *(that is to ſay, different Subſtances) the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and that the Father is before the Son, although the Son was created before all Ages.* Arius *adds, That* Alexander *had ſeveral times preach'd this Doctrin in the Church, and refuted thoſe who did not receive it. This Letter is Sign'd by ſix Prieſts, ſeven Deacons, and three Biſhops,* Secondus *of* Pentapolis, Theonas *of* Lybia, *and* Piſtus *whom the* Arian *Biſhops had Eſtabliſht at* Alexandria.

(a) Socrat. lib. 1. c. 6.] Alexander (a) *wrote on his ſide circular Letters, wherein he ſharply cenſures* Euſebius *of* Nicomedia, *in that he protected* Arius, *and recomended him to others. He joyns to this the Names of thoſe who had been Excommunicated, and explains their Doctrin, wherein he contents not himſelf to ſet down what we have ſeen in* Arius *Letters, touching the beginning which he attributes to the Son; he ſays moreover that this Prieſt maintain'd that the Son is one of the Creatures, that we cannot call him the Reaſon and Wiſdom of the Father but improperly, ſeeing that he himſelf has been produced by the Reaſon and Wiſdom of God;*

that

that he is subject to change, as other intelligent creatures; that he is of another Essence than God; that the Father is incomprehensible to him, and that he knows not himself what is his proper substance; that he has been made for our sakes, to serve God as an Instrument in creating us, and that without this, God had never begotten him. Alexander adds, *That having assembled near an hundred Bishops of* Egypt *and* Lybia, *they had Excommunicated* Arius *and his Followers, by reason of his Opinions.* He afterwards comes to prove his, and shews first, *The Eternity of the Son by this Passage of St. John,* In the Beginning was the Reason. 2. *That he cannot be reckoned among the Creatures; because the Father says of him in the* 45. *Ps.* My heart has uttered (*eructavit*) a good Word. 3. *That he is not unlike the Essence of the Father, of which he is the perfect Image, and the* Splendor, *and of whom he says,* He that has seen me, has seen the Father. 4. *That we cannot say, there was a time in which he was not, seeing that he is the Reason, and the Wisdom of the Father; and that it will be absurd to say, there was a time in which the Father was without Reason and Wisdom.* 5. *That he is not subject to change, because the Scripture says,* He is the same yesterday and to day. 6. That he was not made because of us, *seeing St.* Paul *says, that it is* because of him, and by him that all things are. 7. *That the Father is not incomprehensible to the Son, seeing he says,* As the Father knows me, so I know the Father.

This Letter wherein *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* is extreamly ill treated, shockt this Bishop to the utmost Point, and having great access to the Court, because *Constantine* made then his abode at *Nicomedia,* this occasion'd divers Bishops to be at his Devotion; but he could not engage *Alexander* to forget what had past, to speak no more of this Controversie, and to

receive *Arius* into Communion. The quarrels every day grew hotter, and the People were seen to range themselves, some taking *Arius* side, others *Alexanders*; and the *Comedians* being Gentiles, this gave them occasion to make a Sport of Christian Religion on their Theaters.

Each side treated one another with the odious Name of Heretick, and endeavour'd to shew, that the Sentiments of the opposite Party overthrew the Christian Religion; but it appears, that neither the one, nor the other Party, could yet perswade the Emperor, seeing he wrote to *Alexander* and to *Arius*, a long Letter, of which *Hosius* Bishop of *Cordovia* was the bearer, wherein he equally chides them: He says, he found that the Controversie (a) had begun in this manner; That *Alexander* having demanded of each of his Priests, what they thought of a passage of Scripture, or rather, *on an idle sort of Question?* (ὑπὲρ τινος ματαίου ζητήματος) *Arius* inconsiderately answer'd what he should have thought, or rather conceal'd, if he had thought it, "That from "thence had come his Excommunication, and the "Division of the People. And therefore, he exhorted them to a mutual pardoning of one another, and to receive his Opinion, which was, That "it had been better not to have troubled the Ecclesiasticks with this Question; and that those who "were ask'd it, should have held their Tongues, because the matter concern'd what was equally incomprehensible to both Parties, and which serv'd "only to raise Disturbances among the People. He "could not conceive, how for a Question of very "small Importance, and in which, if they well understood one another, they would find they "agreed

(a) *Apud Euseb. de vit. Const. cap.* 64. & *Seq.* & *Socrat. lib.* 1. c. 7.

" agreed in the main, they should make such a bustle, " and divide themselves in so scandalous a manner. *I do not say this*, adds he, *as if I would constrain you to think the same thing on a most vain Question, or however you will please to call it. For one may without dishonouring the Assembly, and without breaking the Communion, be in different Sentiments in such inconsiderable things. We have not all the same Wills in all things, neither are we all of us of the same temper of Body and Humors. The Emperors Letter*, says Socrates, *gave them admirable Advice, and full of Wisdom; but the Mischief was grown too great, and neither the Emperors Endeavours, nor his Authority, who brought the Letter to* Alexandria, *could appease it.* Alexander had taken care to write every where, to hinder the spreading of *Arius* his Opinions. We have still a long Letter which he wrote to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, wherein he vehemently inveighs against the *Arian* Faction, and endeavours to render it odious; in saying, *That* Arius *maintain'd, that the Son was of a Nature capable of evil as well as of good, although it actually remain'd without sin, and that it was for this, that God had chosen him for his eldest Son. He proves the Eternity of the Son, and that he was not extracted from nothing, because he was in the beginning, and that all things have been made by him. Yet he holds, that the Son has been begotten, and that only the Father is without Generation, although that the* Subsistence, or Substance *of the Son,* (*ousia*) *be incomprehensible to the Angels themselves, and that there is none but melancholy Persons who can think of comprehending it. He afterwards shews, that the manner after which Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is infinitely more excellent than the manner after which Men are, seeing he is so by his Nature, we only by Adoption.* He accuses *Arius*

with following the Doctrin of *Ebion* and *Artemas*, and for having imitated *Paul* of *Samosatia*, Bishop of *Antioch*, whose Doctrin had been embraced by *Lucien*, (Martyr) who by reason of this, had separated himself from the Communion of three following Bishops of this City. He joyns to him three Bishops of *Syria*, who seem to have been, *Paulinus*, *Eusebius*, and *Theodotus*, and reproaches them with using Passages, which relate to the Humiliation of Christ, to attack his Divinity, and to have forgotten those which speak of the Glory of his Nature, such as this is; *The Father and I are one; which the Lord says*, adds he, *not to denote that he is the Father, nor to say, that two Natures, in respect of the manner of existing*, (τῇ ὑποστάσει δύο φύσεις) *are but one; but because the Son is of a Nature, which exactly keeps the Paternal Resemblance, being by his Nature like to him in all things, the unchangeable Image of his Father, and a Copy of this Original. He afterwards defends himself largely against the Consequence which* Arius *drew from his Adversaries Sentiments, which consisted in accusing them, for denying the Generation of the Son, in making him Eternal.* He affirm'd, *That there is an infinite difference between the Creation, of the World, and the Generation of the Son, although this last be wholly incomprehensible, and that he cannot explain it.*

In the mean time, the Division increased so greatly among the People, that in some places, it came to a Sedition, wherein the very Statues (*a*) of the Emperor were thrown down, who appear'd to favour the *Arians*, because he would have 'em tolerated. There was moreover, the Controversie about *Easter*, the one denying that it should be celebrated at the same time as the *Jewish*, and the others affirming it; but this

(*a*) *Euseb. de vit. Cons. lib.* 3. *c.* 4.

this conteſt, had not produced a Schiſm, as *Arianiſm* had done.

Conſtantin ſeeing that theſe Letters had been fruitleſs, thought there was no better way to allay theſe controverſies, than to call a Council from all Parts of the Roman Empire. It was perhaps *Hoſius* who gave him this advice, at leaſt if we may believe *Philoſtorgus* (a), the Biſhop of *Alexandria* being gone to *Nicomedia*, there aſſembled ſome Biſhops of his opinion, with whom *Hoſius* and he conſults, to find out means to ſet up their opinion and to make that of *Arius* condemned; and a little while after the *Emperor* call'd a Council at *Nice*, a Town of *Bithynia*. (b) This was in the year 325, and to the end that nothing might hinder the Biſhops from coming, *Conſtantin* took on himſelf the charges of their journey. The Hiſtorians are not agreed in reference to the number of e'm, ſome ſetting down more than 300 (c) and others leſs. We muſt not wonder at this diverſity, ſeeing there are few paſſages in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, wherein appears more confuſion and neglect than in the Hiſtory of this famous Council. And therefore have we been obliged to extract what we are going to ſay, out of divers Hiſtorians, becauſe none of the Ancients has been compleat in his relations. As to the diverſity obſervable among the Hiſtorians on the ſame facts, we have followed either the moſt ancient, or thoſe which have appeared moſt probable. *Euſebius* who was preſent at the Council, has paſt very lightly over the Circumſtances of this Hiſtory apparently, leſt he ſhould either offend the *Arians*, or the

(a) *lib. 1. c. 7.*

(b) *Euſeb. in vit. Conſt. lib. 3. c. 6.*

(c) *Euſtathius of Antioch ſays there were 270. Theod. l. 1. Conſtantin 300 Socr. II. 9. Euſebius 250 vit. Conſt. lib. 3. c. 9. S. Athanaſ. 318.*

the Orthodox. This affair has never been since discoursed of with an entire disinterest, reports having been often related to certain facts. In a word, there has never any thing happened, whereunto one may apply with more reason these words of *Tacitus*: *Maxima quæque ambigua sunt, dum alii quoquomodo audita pro compertis habent, alii vera in contrarium vertunt, et utraque posteritati.* *Eusebius* vaunts very much of the Bishops which were here, but *Sabinus* (a) a Macedonian Bishop of *Heraclea* a Town of *Thrace*, treats them as Ignoramusses in his collection of Councils. There was likewise a great number of Priests and Deacons, who came in Company with the Bishops.

(a) *Socrat. l. 7.*

The Council opened the 14th. of *June*, and therein were regulated several things, which we shall not here take notice of, designing only to remark what past in relation to the principal question therein decided, to wit *Arianism*. Assoon as ever the Bishops were arrived, they made particular Assemblies without discountenance, and sent for *Arius* (a) to them to inform themselves of his opinions. After they had heard from him what he thought, some of 'em were for condemning all sorts of novelties, and to content themselves in speaking of the Son, in the same terms their predecessors had used; and others affirm'd that the opinions of the Ancients were not to be received without examining. There were seventeen Bishops according to *Sozomen* (b) who favoured *Arius* his new explications, the chief of which were *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, *Eusebius* of *Cesarea*, *Menophantes* of *Ephesus*, *Patrophilus* of *Scythopolis*, *Theognis* of *Nice*, *Narcissus* of *Neronias*, *Theonas*

(a) *Sozom. l. 17. & 19.*

(b) *ib. cap. 20.*

Theonas of *Marmarica*, and *Secundus* of *Ptolemais*. These Bishops drew up a Confession of Faith (e) according to their sentiments, but they had no sooner read it in the Assembly, but it was cryed out upon as false; it was torn in pieces, and they were reproached with it as Persons who would, as they said, betray the Faith and the Godhead of Christ. A Letter of *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, wherein he exprest his thoughts, had the same fate.

(e) Theod. lib. 1. c. 7.

In fine, a Creed was undertaken to be made, wherein the opinions contrary to those of *Arius* were established. It was immediately observ'd that the new ways of speaking which the *Arians* used, were to be condemned, *That the Son had been extracted from nothing*; *that he was a Creature*; *that there was a time wherein he was not*, &c. and Scripture Phrases were to be used, such as these; *Only begotten Son*, *the Word*, *Power*, *Wisdom of the Father*, *the brightness of his Glory*, *and character of his Power*. The *Arians* having shew'd that they were ready to admit a Confession exprest in these terms; the Orthodox Bishops fear'd lest they should expound these terms in an ill sense. And therefore they were for adding that the Son is *of the Substance of the Father*, because this is that which distinguishes the Son from the Creatures. Hereupon the *Arians* were asked, whether they acknowledged, *That the Son is not a Creature, but the Power, the only Wisdom and Image of the Father*; *that he is Eternal, and like to the Father in all things*; *in fine, that God*. The *Heterodox* have spoken among themselves, believ'd that these expressions might very well agree with the notion they had of the Divinity of the Son, and denoted they were ready to receive them.

In

In fine, it being obſerv'd that *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, in the Letter which was read, rejected the Term of *Conſubſtantial*, (ὁμοούσιον) it was thought, that the Orthodox Doctrin could not be better expreſs'd, and all Equivocation excluded, than in making uſe of it; and ſo much the rather, in that the *Arians* ſeem'd to be afraid of it. This Circumſtance is owing to St. *Ambroſe*, (a) whoſe Words are theſe:

(a) Lib. 3. de fid. ad Grat. cap. ult.

Auctor ipſorum Euſebius Nicomediæ Epiſcopus, Epiſtola ſua prodidit, dicens; ſi verum inquit, Dei filium interetum dicimus, homoouſion, Conſubſtantialem cum Patre incipimus confiteri. Hæc cum lecta eſſet Epiſtola in Concilio Nicæno, hoc verbum in tractatu fidei poſuerunt Patres quod viderunt Adverſariis eſſe formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipſis gladio ipſum nefandæ caput Hæreſeos amputarent.

The Orthodox conceiv'd then their Sentiment, touching the Divinity of the Son in theſe Terms:

(b) Soc. lib. 1. c. 8.

(b) We believe in one only Lord Jeſus Chriſt, Son of God, only Son of the Father, that is to ſay, of the Subſtance of the Father, God, born of God, Light of Light, true God, born of the true God, begotten, not made, Conſubſtantial with the Father.

The *Arians* in vain complain'd, that theſe Words were not to be found in Scripture; They were told, that thoſe they were wont to uſe, were no more there neither, being wholly new; whereas it was near ſixſcore years ſince, that ſeveral Biſhops had uſed the Word, *Conſubſtantial*.

The Fathers of the Council, during this Time, were not ſo buſied in vanquiſhing the *Arians*, and in making ſeveral Regulations, but that they remembred their private grudges. *Several Church-*

men,

men, says *Sozomen*, (a) *as if they had been assembled to prosecute their particular Affairs, as it commonly happens, thought this a fit time to get those punish'd who had offended them. Each of 'em presented Requests to the Emperor, wherein they accused one or other, and signified the wrong they had done them. This hapning every day, the Emperor set one a part in which they were every one of 'em to bring his Grievance. The day being come, the Emperor took all their Requests, and caused 'em to be thrown into the Fire, and exhorted them to a mutual Forgiveness, according to the Precepts of the Gospel. He afterwards enjoyn'd them to labour in clearing up the Points of Faith, of which they were to be Judges, and a fixt day, wherein the Question of the Consubstantiality should be decided.*

(a) Lib. 1. c. 17

The day appointed (a) being come, *Constantine* convocated all the Bishops into an Hall of the Palace, where he had caus'd Chairs to be set on both sides. The Bishops entred first, and the Emperor came in afterwards, and did not sit down at the Head of the Assembly on a gilded Seat, which he caused to be there placed, till the Bishops, by Signs had giv'n him leave. Being set down, *Eusebius* of *Cesarea*, who was at his Right Hand, harang'd him, and thank'd him, for the care he had taken to preserve the Purity of the Catholick Faith. *Constantin* afterwards began to speak, and made a Discourse in Latin, wherein he represented, That he had no greater Affliction than the Divisions he observ'd among Christians, exhorting the Bishops very earnestly to Peace. An Interpreter afterwards turn'd the Speech into Greek, for the Eastern Bishops understood not Latin.

(a) *Euseb. vit. Const. lib.* 3. *c.* 10.

Although it seems, that Business was prepared in particular Assemblies before-hand, yet there arose at

firſt a great Controverſie; and *Conſtantine* had the patience to hear long Conteſts, wherein he exerciſed the Office of Moderator, in endeavouring to accord thoſe, whoſe Sentiments or Expreſſions appear'd remote, in upholding the Arguments which ſeem'd to him weak, and in giving Praiſes to ſuch, who ſeem'd to ſpeak well. *Euſebius* of *Ceſarea* long held out againſt the uſe which they would (*a*) make of the Word *Conſubſtantial.* He offered another Confeſſion of Faith, wherein it was omitted, and wherein he call'd the Son barely, *God* born *of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, only Son, firſt born of all Creatures, begotten of his Father before all Worlds.* The Emperor approv'd this Confeſſion of Faith, and exhorted the Fathers of the Synod to follow it, in adding thereto only the Word *Conſubſtantial.*

(*a*) *Socrat. lib.* 1. *c.* 8. &c. *Theod. lib.* 1. *cap.* 12.

Afterwards the Confeſſion was read, which had been drawn up with this Word, the Terms of which have been already recited. Anathema's were joyn'd thereto, againſt thoſe who ſhould uſe on this Occaſion other Terms, than thoſe of the Holy Scripture, which muſt be underſtood, with an Exception of thoſe, which the Council thought fit to conſecrate. This Propoſition was particularly condemn'd, *That the Son exiſted not before he was begotten.* *Euſebius*, and others requeſted, That the Terms of the Symbol, and Anathema's might be explain'd. 1. It was ſaid, That the Word *Begotten*, was uſed and not made, becauſe this laſt Word expreſſes the Production of Creatures, to which the Son has no likeneſs, being of a Subſtance far more excellent than they, begotten by the Father in an incomprehenſible manner. 2. As for the Word *Conſubſtantial*, it is proper to the Son, not in the ſenſe wherein it is taken, when we ſpeak

of Bodies, or mortal Animals, the Son being Conſubſtantial with the Father, neither by a Diviſion of the Divine Subſtance, of which he poſſeſſes a part, nor by any change of this ſame Subſtance. The meaning of which is only this, That the Son has no Reſemblance with the Creatures which he has made, but, that he is in all things like to his Father, by whom he has been begotten; or that he is not of another Hypoſtaſis, or Subſtance, but of that of the Father.

3. Thoſe were condemn'd, who ſaid, that the Son was not before he was born, ſeeing that he exiſted before his corporal Birth, and even before his divine Generation, according to *Conſtantin*'s Argument. (*a*) *For before*, ſaid he, *that he was actually begotten, he was in Power in his Father, in a manner unbegotten, the Father having been always Father, as he is ever always King and Saviour, and all things in his Power, being eternally in the ſame Condition.*

(*a*) Theſe Words of *Euſebius*'s Letter, are not to be found but in *Theodoret*, *Socrates* having retrenched them.

It will perhaps ſeem, that this is pure *Arianiſm*, and that this is to deny the Eternity of the Son; but we muſt obſerve, that in the Style of that time, to exiſt before the World, and to be eternal, is the ſame thing; ſeeing, that to prove his Eternity, this Paſſage is cited, (*b*) *In the Beginning was the Word*; and it ſufficed to ſhew, that he was begotten, before there was any time.

(*b*) *Vid Ep. Alexandri Ep.*

So that we muſt not reject theſe Words, as ſuppoſitious, meerly for this Reaſon; and it is ſo ordinary to find hard Expreſſions, in thoſe who attempt to explain, in any ſort, this incomprehenſible Myſtery; that if one might hence judge of them, one would be apt to declare them all Hereticks, which is to ſay, to anathemize the greateſt part of the Ancients.

Besides this St. *Athanasius* who (*a*) openly treats *Eusebius* as an *Arian*, makes allusion to one part of this passage, and draws thence a consequence which *Eusebius* without doubt would not have owned, which is, that the *Arians* believed that the Divinity of Jesus Christ did not exist before his corporal Birth.

(*a*) De Decret. Nicen. Tom. I. pag. 241.

After these explications *Eusebius* subscribed, as he himself testifies in the Letter above recited, (*b*) altho' he had refused it the day before. The long and formal opposition which he had made against the word Consubstantial, caused it to be suspected that there was want of sincerity in this subscription. In fine *Arius* and his Party were anathematized, and all their Books condemned, and particularly a Poem which *Arius* had entituled *Thalia*. Most of the *Arian* Bishops subscribed, after *Eusebius* his example, to this confession of Faith and the Anathema's after the explications above mentioned. Yet there were some of 'em, who refused at first to sign, (*a*) the principal of which were *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, *Theognis* of *Nice*, *Maris* of *Calcedon*, *Theodotus* of *Marmarica* and *Secundus* of *Ptolemaida*. They were immediately Excommunicated by the Council, and were to be sent afterwards as well as *Arius*, into *Exile* by *Constantin*. The Council wrote a circular Letter (*b*) to the Churches of *Egypt*, denoting to 'em in what sort they had carried themselves in the business of *Arius*, and what had been ordered touching the Schismatical Bishop, and the observation of *Easter*. *Constantin* wrote also to the Church of *Alexandria*, to assure it that after a full and

(*b*) Albinus ibid.

(*a*) Socr. lib. 1. cap. 8.

(*b*) Socr. lib. 1. Cap. 9.

matur

mature examination, *Arius* had been condemned by the common consent. He greatly vaunted of the moderation and learning of the Bishops, making no mention of their quarrels, according to the Custom observed in publick Acts, and such like occasions, where every thing is suppreſt which may give an ill opinion of the Decrees of these kinds of Assemblies. In another Letter directed to the Bishops and Churches, he enjoyns the name of *Porphyrus* to be given to *Arius*, and his followers to be called *Porphyrians*. This *Porphyry* was a famous *Platonist*, who had written against the Christian Religion, and whose Books *Constantin* had caus'd to be burnt. *Lucas Holstenius* has written his Life, which is to be found at the end of the Book *of the Abstinence of Animals*. *Constantin* design'd to declare hereby *Arius* an Enemy to the Christian Religion, and not in any manner reproach him with being a Platonist, touching the Trinity, seeing *Constantin* did not disapprove, as we have seen, the sentiments of *Plato*. It's true the *Arians* have been upbraided with their too great application to the reading of this Philosopher, and other Heathen Authors: *Revera de Platonis et Aristophanis sinu*, says St. Jerom, (a) *in episcopatum alleguntur. Quotus enim quisque est qui non apprime in his eruditus sit? Accedit ad hoc quod Ariana hæresis magis cum sapientia seculi facit, et argumentationum rivos de Aristotelis fontibus mutuatur.* Thus the Orthodox and Hereticks equally approved the sentiments of *Plato*, each of them apparently explaining them, according to his Hypothesis. *Constantin* further ordered in the same Letter to burn all *Arius* his Books; *to the end that not only his pernicious Doctrin be destroyed, but that there remain no monument*

(a) *Adverſ. Lucif. T. 2. p.* 142.

monument of it to posterity. He likewise declared that if any one concealed any of his Books, and did not bring them to be burnt, he should be put to death after it had been proved upon him. There is moreover another Letter of this Emperor, wherein he enjoyns all Churches to celebrate *Easter*, according to the Canons of the Council.

Eusebius and *Theognis*, either effectually believing that the Creed of the Council might admit an *Arian* sense, (*a*) or affrighted by the Emperors severity, offered to sign the Creed, but refused to anathematize *Arius*, affirming that opinions were attributed to him which he never did one. *Eusebius* so ordered, by the means of his Friends, about the Emperor, (*b*) that what he desired was granted him, which is to say, that they were contented with his subscription to the Creed. *Theognis* and *Maris* did as much; and the Letter of the Council to the Churches of *Egypt* mentions only *Theonas*, and *Secundus* who had absolutely stood out. *Philostorgus* likewise acknowledges (*a*) that all the *Arian* Bishops subscribed except two; and reproaches the rest with their insincerity in that they had explain'd after the *Arian* fashion the terms of the Council, by the advice of *Constantia* the Emperors Sister. He adds that *Secundus* setting out to go into his Exile, said to *Eusebius*; *you have subscribed*, Eusebius, *that you might not be banisht, but for my part I believe what God has revealed to me, which is, that you shall be carried into Exile, before the year comes about.*

(*a*) *Socrat. lib.* 1. *cap.* 14.

(*b*) *ex. Epist. Const. ad Nicomed. ap. Theod. lib.* I. *cap.* 20.

(*a*) *lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. & 9.

Arius, if we believe the Orthodox, had not the Courage to resolve on Banishment, with *Secundus* and *Theonas*

Theonas. He pretended a desire to be better instructed, and sought an occasion of conferring with *Athanasius*, Deacon of *Alexandria*, (*b*) whose Acts are still extant. If this Relation be true, one may conjecture, That *Arius* designedly defended himself but ill, the better to yield to his Adversaries Reasons, as he did, to obtain his Grace. He acknowledges at the end of this Conference, the Equality and Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father; after which, he shews himself entirely reclaim'd from his Error. The Fathers of the Council receiv'd him, as a Penitent, without settling him in his Employ; and the Emperor only forbad him to go to *Alexandria*. *Euzoius* and *Achillas* collegues of *Arius* were also pardoned; and St. *Jerome* adds (*a*) to them eight Bishops, of which he names but three, and one Priest, *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, *Theognis* of *Nice*, *Saras*, Priest of *Lybia*, and *Eusebius* Bishop of *Cesarea*. It appears from the sequel of the Dialogue, that the *Arians* denied that the Bishops of their Party were reconciled at *Nice*, but St. *Jerom* grounds himself on the Acts and Subscriptions of this Council, which yet he had not then at hand, excusing himself from naming the four other reconciled Bishops by a Rhetorical Figure, *& reliqui, quos enumerare longum est*. There needed not so much time for to set down four names, but without doubt, he did not remember them.

(*b*) *Athan. T. 1. p. 111.*

(*a*) *In Lucifer. p. 145. T. 2.*

The first who sign'd the Council among the Orthodox, was *Hosius*, Bishop of *Cordova*, afterwards, *Vitonius* and *Vincent*, Roman Priests, sent by *Sylvester*; after them, the Bishops of *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Jerusalem*; and in fine, the other Bishops. Those who favour the Pretensions of the Church of *Rome*, say,

ſay, That *Hoſius* ſign'd in Quality of Legat, from the Biſhop of that City, but the moſt ancient Hiſtorians have not a Word of it.

The Council ending the 25th of *Auguſt*, *Conſtantin* took his farewel of them, in a very fine Harangue, (*a*) wherein he exhorted the Fathers to thoughts of Peace, and to a mutual Forbearance; but which, was of little Effect, as will appear by the Sequel. Thus ended this famous Council, the Circumſtances of which, would be better known to us, if the fear of offending great Perſons, the Zeal of ſome, the Paſſion of others, and the Reſpect which Poſterity has had for the Deciſions of ſo famous an Aſſembly, had not hindred contemporary Authors from writing the Hiſtory with exactneſs, and the Diſengagement remarkable in good Hiſtorians; and retain'd thoſe who have liv'd ſince, from ſaying what they knew (perhaps) that was diſadvantagious. St. *Athanaſius*, in a little Treatiſe already cited, and where he ſeems at firſt to be willing to enter on this Hiſtory, tranſported by the Zeal of which he was full, falls on Controverſie and Invectives; when one might expect him ready to relate Circumſtances. *Sozomen* ſays, *That he did not dare to relate the Creed of* Nice, (*a*) *becauſe ſome of his pious and learned Friends in this matter, adviſed him to ſuppreſs the things, which the Initiates, and the Prieſts alone ſhould underſtand, and that according to their Council, he had conceal'd what was to be kept ſilent.*

(*a*) *Euſeb. in vit. ejus*

(*a*) *Lib.* 1. *c.* 20.

A while after, the Emperor (*b*) being to celebrate the Feaſt of his *Vicennales*, which is to ſay, of the twentieth Year of his Empire, invited the Biſhops to *Byzantia*, which he thought of re-eſtabliſhing, in giving it the new Name

(*b*) *Sozom. lib.* 1. *c.* 25.

Name of *Constantinople*, where he magnificently treated them, and made each of 'em a-part a Present, after which, they return'd to their Bishopricks. It seems, that it was about this time, that he wrote very obliging Letters to *Eusebius* of *Cesarea*, (c) in giving him order to procure him fifty Copies fairly written, of the Holy Scripture.

(c) *Socr. lib. 1. cap. 9.*

As to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis* his Friend, they were no sooner return'd into their Bishopricks, but they began again to Preach publickly *Arianism*, (d) and receiv'd into their Communion some Persons of *Alexandria*, who had been thence expelled for this Opinion. *Constantin* advertised of this, sent them into Exile, three Months after the Council, and establish'd at *Nicomedia* one *Amphion* for Bishop, and *Chrestus* at *Nice*. Thus was *Secondus*'s Prediction accomplish'd, and Insincerity punished.

(d) *Ex. Epi. Const. ad Nicom. l.*

Two Months after, *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, died, which occasion'd great Disturbances in that City. The Orthodox (e) say, that *Athanasius*, Deacon of this Church, whom *Alexander* had brought along with him to *Nice*, by reason of his Knowledge, had been denoted several times by this Bishop, for his Successor, but that he had hid himself a little before his Death, for fear of being Elected, and that having been found, he was chosen by a Plurality of Voices.

(e) *Serm. II. 17. Philost. III.*

The Heterodox affirm, on the contrary, that the *Melitians* being re-united to the Catholicks, after the Death of *Alexander*, fifty-four Bishops of *Egypt* took an Oath, to elect by common consent his Successor, but that seven among them broke their Oaths, and chose *Athanasius*, without the Participation of the rest. Some even assure, that the Voices were divided, and the Election not being made quick enough, *Athanasius* shut himself

up with two Biſhops, into St. *Denys*'s Church, and cauſed himſelf to be conſecrated maugre the other Biſhops, who made the Church-doors be broken open, but too late, the Ceremony being over. Hereupon they Excommunicated him; but having ſtrengthn'd his Party, he wrote in the Name of the City to the Emperor, to give him Notice of his Election, which was approv'd by this Prince, who believ'd theſe Letters came effectually from the Magiſtracy of *Alexandria*. There may have been Paſſion on the ſide of the Heterodox; but heating our ſelves as we do, for the Truth, as well as for Errour, and upholding ſometimes the right ſide by indirect ways, we may admit of ſome things which the Heterodox ſay, and not blindly receive, whatever the Orthodox relate.

It ſeems about this time, *Conſtantin* made his Conſtitution (*a*) againſt the meetings of all Hereticks, wherein he forbids them to aſſemble either in publick or private, gives their Chappels to Catholicks, and confiſcates the Houſes wherein they are found to meet, performing their Devotions. *Euſebius* adds, that the Emperors Edict moreover contain'd, that all Heretical Books ſhould be ſeiz'd on; and that *Conſtantin*'s threatnings obliged a great number of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks to range themſelves on the ſide of the Orthodox Church. But ſome doing of it ſincerely, and others by force, the Biſhops applied themſelves carefully to diſtinguiſh them, and receiv'd only into the Church thoſe who were real Converts. The *Arians* had been ruin'd by particular Edicts, ſo that all Hereſies ſeem'd to be aboliſhed in the Roman Empire.

(*a*) *Euſeb. in ejus vit. lib. III. c. 64.*

But *Conſtantin*, who had at firſt ſlighted the ſubject of the Diſpute, between *Arius* and *Alexander*, as conſiſting only of different Expreſſions, and who afterwards had conſidered it, as a Point of the greateſt Importance

portance, return'd again to a good Opinion of *Arius*; whether he acted according to his present Interests, or that he suffered himself to be led by those who were most about him, or that in fine, he really chang'd his Opinion. (a) *Constantia*, Sister of *Constantin* and Widow of *Licinus*, had among her Domesticks, a Priest, a friend to *Arius*, who held the same Opinions as he did, and who perswaded this Princess, that *Arius* held not those Opinions he he was charged with, in the manner as they were usually express'd, that *Alexander* had accused him through Envy, because he was esteem'd by the People, and that the Council had done him wrong. *Constantia*, who much confided in this Priest, easily believ'd him, but dared not speak her Mind to the Emperour; and being fall'n dangerously sick, all that she could do before she died, was to recommend this Priest to her Brother, as a man highly vertuous, and much devoted to the service of her Family. A while after she died, and this Priest having gotten the favour of *Constantin*, held to him the same Discourse, telling him, That if he pleas'd to admit *Arius* to come before him, and to explain his Opinion, he would find that at bottom, his Doctrin was the same as that of the Council which condemn'd him. *Constantin* surpriz'd at the oddness of this Discourse, answer'd, That if *Arius* would sign the *Nicene Creed*, he would let him come into his Presence, and would send him honourably to *Alexandria*. This Priest having assured him of it, *Constantin* sent Word to *Arius* to come to Court, and *Arius* not daring at first to do it, the Emperor wrote a Note to him, in which he ordered him to come immediately at his Charge: *Arius* obeyed this reiterated Order, and being come to *Constantinople* with *Eusebius*, they presented to the

(a) *Socrat. lib. 1 c. 25. ex Ruffin.*

Emperor a Confeſſion of their Faith, wherein they barely ſaid, *They believ'd that the Son was begotten of the Father before all Ages, and that the Reaſon, who is God, had made all things, as well in Heav'n as in Earth.* *Conſtantin* was fully ſatisfi'd with this Declaration, ſo that either he had chang'd his Mind, or giv'n ſmall Attention, or little comprehended the ſenſe of the *Nicene* Creed. However it was, it appears by the Sequel, That the *Arian* Biſhops came by Degrees into favor, and that the Emperor treated *Arius* with great kindneſs, and permitted him to return to *Alexandria*.

It's not punctually known when *Arius* was re-call'd, but it's certain, he had been already, when *Euſebius* and *Theognis* were, which hapned three years after the Council of *Nice*, in the year 328, according to the relation of *Philoſtorgus*, (a) theſe two Biſhops wrote from the place of their Baniſhment a Letter, wherein they complain, (b) *That they had been condemn'd without being heard, altho their conduct had been approved of in the Council, where having well examin'd the word* Conſubſtantial, *they had in fine approved of it. They added, they had only refuſed to Anathematize* Arius, *becauſe they knew he was not ſuch a one as he was deſcribed; and ſeeing this was acknowledg'd by his being recalled, it could not be juſt that they who ſuffered only on his account, ſhould remain in Exile after his Revocation. This Letter was directed to the principal Biſhops, whom* Euſebius *and* Theognis *entreated to interceed for them with the Emperor.* In ſpeaking of the Repeal of *Arius*, they directly attribute it to theſe Biſhops: *Your Piety*, ſay they, *has thought fit to treat him gently, and to recal him.* A Learned man (c) obſerves in this place, that *Euſebius* and *Theognis* attribute to the Biſhops what the Emperor had done, ſeeing

(a) *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 18.

(b) *Socr. lib.* 1. *cap.* 14.

(c) *Valeſius ad locum.*

it

it was he that had recalled *Arius*; and that the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians attribute likewiſe ſometimes to the Emperor the actions of the Biſhops, as when *Socrates* ſays that the Council of *Nice* forbad *Arius* his return to *Alexandria*, whereas it was the Emperor. But in truth the Emperor did then few things of his own pure motion, being only the Church men's Tool, which falls out but too often, even among the greateſt Princes.

The Letter of *Euſebius* and *Theognis* produced the effect which they hoped from it. They were recalled with *Theonas* and *Secundus* who would ſign nothing. The two firſt being returned to their Biſhopricks, drove out thence thoſe who had gotten into their Sees, when they were ſent to their places of baniſhment. They are charged with having immediately after ſought out ways to make *Athanaſius* undergoe the ſame puniſhment, which they came from ſuffering, by getting it told the Emperor, that he had been elected in a manner little canonical, and with endeavouring to induce the ſame *Athanaſius* both by Prayers and threatnings, to permit *Arius* to return to *Alexandria*. However they could not then accompliſh their purpoſe; and we ſhall ſee in the ſequel the bickerings which they had with this Biſhop.

Since the Council of *Nice* had been diſtmiſt, and that they had been baniſht. This uſage, and the deciſions of *Nice* had but only outwardly allai'd the diſputes, which laſts ſtill when they were recalled. *Euſebius* aſſures us that the Biſhops of *Egypt* had been ever ſince over Head and Ears in quarrels; and *Socrates* ſays (*a*) that he found from the Letters of the Biſhops of thoſe times, that ſome were ſcandaliz'd at the word *Conſubſtantial*; *examining*, ſays he, *this term with too great application*

(*a*) *lib.* 1. *c.* 23.

application, they fell foul on one another, and their quarrels did not ill reſemble a combat in the dark. It appears they ſufficiently beſpattered one another with calumnies, without knowing wherefore. Thoſe who rejected the word Conſubſtantial, *thought the others hereby introduced the opinions of* Sabellius *and* Montanus, *and treated them as impious, as denying the exiſtence* (ὑπόστασιν) *of the Son of God. On the contrary thoſe who ſtuck to the word* Conſubſtantial, *imagining the others would introduce a plurality of Gods, had as great averſion, as if they would have reeſtabliſht Paganiſm.* Euſtathius *Biſhop of* Antioch *accuſed* Euſebius *Biſhop of* Ceſarea *for the Nicene Creed.* Euſebius *denied it, and charged on the other ſide* Euſtathius *of* Sabellianiſm; *thus the Biſhops wrote one againſt another. They all accorded in ſaying the Son has a particular Exiſtence, and that there is only one God in three Hypoſtaſes; yet they could not agree, nor remain quiet.* This is the effect of equivocal terms, which were introduced into Chriſtianity without well defining them, and the bad cuſtom of moſt of the Ancients, who never ſpeak calmly of theſe matters; who have thought of nothing leſs than the expreſſing themſelves clearly, and who ſeem to prove they ſpake ſincerely, when they teſtified to believe, that the miſtery about which they diſputed was incomprehenſible; by expreſſing themſelves thereon in an unintelligible manner. *Euſtathius* Biſhop of *Antioch* (*a*) accuſing of Arianiſm *Euſebius* of *Ceſarea*, *Paulinus* of *Tyre*, and *Patrophilus* of *Scythopolis*; and theſe Biſhops accuſing him in their turns of *Sabellianiſm*; to know who had reaſon on their ſide, a Synod was aſſembled at *Antioch* in 329. the concluſions of which were diſadvantagious to *Euſtathius*. It conſiſted of Biſhops, who had ſign'd the Nicene Creed only by force, among whom were

(*a*) *Socr. lib.* 1. *cap.* 24.

were the two *Euſebius*'s, *Theognis* of *Nice*, *Theodotus* of *Laodicea* in *Syria*, *Narciſſus* of *Neroniada*, *Aetius* of *Lydia*, *Alphæus* of *Apamea*, and *Theodorus* of *Sidon*. Aſſoon as ever they arriv'd at *Antioch*, a Woman of ill fame preſented her ſelf to 'em with a little Child, which ſhe ſaid to have had by *Euſtathius*, and deſired them to do her right againſt him, as refuſing to receive his Child. *Euſtathius* made great proteſtations of his innocency, but this Woman having been believed upon her Oath, he was depoſed; (a) ſome Authors affirmed that the *Arian* Biſhops had ſuborn'd her, to have an occaſion for the depoſing of *Euſtathius*; and that the true cauſe of his depoſal was his adherence to the Nicene Creed. Others ſay it was the pretended *Sabellianiſm* of which he was accuſed, and ſome have contented themſelves with ſaying there were other accuſations, for which he had been depoſed, whereupon *Socrates* (b) makes this remarkable reflection: *The Biſhops are wont to deal thus with all thoſe whom they depoſe; accuſing and declaring them impious, without ſhewing wherein.*

(a) *Theod. & Sozom.*

(b) *loco. cit.*

A Biſhop was afterwards to be ſubſtituted in *Euſtathius* his place, and the *Arian* Biſhops caſt their eyes on *Euſebius* of *Ceſarea*. But there aroſe a violent ſedition hereupon; ſome willing to retain *Euſtathius*, and others accepting *Euſebius*. They had come to Fiſticuffs, had not the Emperor taken care, by ſending one of his Officers who appeaſed the People, and made them underſtand how *Euſtathius* deſerv'd to be ſent into Exile, and in effect he was ſent into *Thrace*. However *Euſebius* did a thing, which made him receive very honourable Letters from the Emperor, which he has inſerted in the life of this Prince, which is, that according to the Canons, he refuſed to paſs

from

from one Church to another. *Conſtantin* heaped up Praiſes on him by reaſon of this refuſal, and wrote to the Council, and the Church of *Antioch* to let him remain where he was. So that inſtead of *Euſebius*, there was elected *Euphronius* Prieſt of *Cappadocia*, whom the Emperor had named with *George* of *Arethuſa*, to the end the Council might chooſe which they pleaſed.

(a) *Soz.* 1. 27. & *Seq. Soz. Theod.*

(a) Having depoſed *Euſtathius*, the *Arian* Biſhops labored to procure the return of *Arius* to *Alexandria*, where *Athanaſius* would not permit him to enter, as has been already ſaid. They engaged the Emperor to write to this Biſhop, but *Athanaſius* ſtill defended himſelf, in that he could not receive into the Church thoſe who had forſook the Faith and been excommunicated; ſo that *Conſtantin* wrote to him an angry Letter, that he ſhould receive into the Church thoſe he ordered him, under pain of baniſhment. The obſtinacy of this Biſhop, who would part with none of the advantages which the Council of *Nice* had granted to his Predeceſſor againſt the *Meletians*, had alſo drawn on him the enmity of theſe Schiſmaticks. The Council had ordained that *Melece* ſhould only retain the name of Biſhop, without exerciſing any function of his Office, and without ordaining any Succeſſor; and that thoſe whom he had ordained ſhould have no part in Elections. However *Melece* at his death had ordained one *John* for his Succeſſor, and the Meletian Prieſts would have the ſame privileges as others. *Athanaſius* could not conſent to any thing of this, and equally ill treated the *Meletians* and *Arians*. This conduct reunited the two parties, who had been till that time oppoſite. The *Meletians* were of the Nicene opinion; but by converſing with

the

the *Arians*, they ſoon entred into their Sentiments, and joyn'd together, to induce *Conſtantin* to accept of ſeveral Accuſations againſt *Athanaſius*; as having impoſed a kind of Tribute on *Egypt*, in ordering it to furniſh the Church of *Alexandria* with a certain number of Linnen Garments; in having ſupplied a certain ſeditious Perſon with Mony; named *Philumenus*; in having cauſed a Chalice to be broken, overthrown the Table of a Church, and burnt the Holy Books; for having miſ-uſed ſeveral Prieſts, and committed divers Violences; in having cut off the Arm of a *Meletian* Biſhop, named *Arſenius*, and keeping it to uſe in Magical Operations. *Conſtantin* acknowledg'd the Innocency of *Athanaſius*, in regard of the two firſt Accuſations; and for the reſt, he refer'd it to an Aſſembly of divers Biſhops, which was at *Ceſarea* in *Paleſtine*, where *Athanaſius* not appearing, he was cited to a Synod at *Tyre*, in the year 334. and which conſiſted of Biſhops of *Egypt*, *Lybia*, *Aſia*, and *Europa*. *Athanaſius* was in Suſpence, whether he ſhould preſent himſelf to this Synod, which conſiſted of his principal Enemies? Yet *Conſtantin* having threatned him with Baniſhment if he refuſed, he therefore appeared, and juſtified himſelf of the Accuſation touching the Arm of *Arſinius*, by bringing in this Perſon into the midſt of them, and deriding his Accuſers. It's ſaid moreover, That a Woman being introduced into the Aſſembly, accuſed him for having diſhonoured her, after ſhe had entertain'd him in her Houſe, although he knew ſhe had made a Vow of Virginity. But it appeared, that ſhe did not ſo much as know *Athanaſius*, ſeeing ſhe took one *Timotheus*, a Prieſt for him, who pretended to be the Biſhop of *Alexandria*.

The business of the broken Chalice, and the misusing the Priests, was a little more difficult. *Athanasius* began by an Appeal from *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and the rest of the Bishops of his Party. He afterwards said, That he, whose Chalice was pretended to have been broken, and whose Name was *Ischyras*, was not a Priest. However, without any regard to these Reasons, there were sent some *Arian* Bishops, to take Informations against him at *Alexandria*, with *Ischyras* his Accuser; but he protested highly against this Proceeding, and went to *Jerusalem*, where the Emperour was. In the mean time, the Informations from *Egypt* were receiv'd, and *Athanasius* being loaded with them, he was deposed in his Absence, and forbid to go to *Alexandria*. *Arsenius* having been admitted into Communion by the Council, and made Bishop of *Hypsele*, a Town of *Egypt*, subscribed to the Deposition of *Athanasius*, although he had justify'd him, in reference to one of the Accusations brought against him. The Sentence of the Council bore, that he had slighted the Emperors Orders, and made the Assembly wait for him in an indecent manner; That he came to *Tyre* with a great multitude of People, and endeavour'd to make a Disturbance there; That he had for sometime refused to purge himself of the Crimes laid to his Charge, and uttered Injuries to divers Bishops; That he would not submit to their judgment; That he was convicted of breaking a Chalice, by the Informations made against him at *Alexandria*. Thus was *Athanasius* condemned by his Enemies, who were his Judges, as *Arius* had been anathematiz'd by *Alexander* his Predecessor, and several other Bishops, who had declared themselves against him,

him, before the Convocation of the Council. The same usage has been observ'd in all the Assemblies of Bishops which have met since, the Clergy having this Advantage above the Laity, that they can be both Judges and Parties.

After the Deposal of *Athanasius*, the Emperor wrote to the Fathers of the Council, to repair as soon as possible to *Jerusalem*, to celebrate the Dedication of the Church of the Apostles, which was now finished. Where being arriv'd, they were magnificently receiv'd, and made several Orations, for the greater Solemnity of the Festival, which hapned to be very luckily, in the same year in which the *Tricennales* of the Emperor (a) were to be celebrated, which is to say, the 30th year of his Reign. *Eusebius* (b) particularly made several Harangs before the Emperor, who took a great deal of pleasure in hearing them, insomuch that he would hear standing a long Oration, which this Bishop made on the holy Sepulchre. *Eusebius* well remembers this Honour the Emperor did him, and the Praises he gave to his Oration touching *Easter*, and carefully inserts in the Life of *Constantin*, all the Letters he had receiv'd from the Emperor; perhaps, not out of Acknowledgment, but rather to do himself Honour, (c) as has been reproach'd him.

(a) In the Year, 335.

(b) *In vit. Const. lib.* iv. *c.* 33.

(c) *Baronius ad hæc tempora.*

The Bishops assembled at *Jerusalem*, (b) having ended the Dedication of the Church, which *Constantin* had newly built, and there receiv'd into Communion *Arius* and *Euzoius*, on the Emperors Recommendations.

(b) *Socr. lib.* i. *c.* 33.

Euſebius and *Theognis* ſay, that *Arius* had been *kindly* receiv'd by the Biſhops, but in no ſort, that he was received into Communion, which was, perhaps, for ſome years refuſed him, to try his Sincerity. Afterwards they wrote to the Church of *Alexandria*, that ſhe might receive them, and be aſſured, ſhe would enjoy hence-forward a full Tranquility, Envy having been driv'n out thence, by the Depoſal of *Athanaſius*. (a) In the mean time this Biſhop had gotten to *Conſtantinople*, to complain to the Emperor of what he had ſuffered; but he could obtain no Audience of him; all that he could be heard to ſay, was, That he entreated the Emperor to cite to *Conſtantinople* the Biſhops which were at *Jeruſalem*, to have another Examination of his Affair. *Conſtantin* wrote to *Jeruſalem*, and complains in his Letter, that in a time wherein the *Barbarians* began to acknowledge the true God; "The Chriſtians, "who would be thought to have the Myſteries of "God in their keeping, (for he durſt not ſay that "they kept them,) labour'd only to entertain Di"viſions and hatred among them, not to ſay, for "the Deſtruction of Mankind. And therefore he deſired that the Biſhops aſſembled at *Jeruſalem*, would meet at *Conſtantinople*, to examine once for all, the Affair of *Athanaſius*, and put ſome end to it. This Letter being come to *Jeruſalem*, ſome of the Biſhops return'd to their Dioceſes, and others to *Conſtantinople*. Theſe laſt perſwaded, according to ſome Authors, (a) the Emperor, that *Athanaſius* had effectually broken a Council; or according to others, (b) that he had threatned to ſtop the Convoy of Provi-

(c) *Sozom. lib.* II. 28.

(a) *Id.*

(b) *Socr. lib.* I. *cap.* 35.

Provisions which went every year from *Alexandria* to *Constantinople*, of which three Bishops were Witnesses. The Emperor provoked by these Accusations, ordered him to retire to *Treves*, a Town of the *Belgick Gaule*, where he remain'd about two years.

The Bishops who were met at *Constantinople* (c) deposed after this *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, as being fall'n into the opinion of *Paul* of *Samosatia*. One *Asterius* who had taught Rhetorick in *Cappadocia*, having embraced the Christian Religion, had wrote some Books, wherein he spake of the Divinity of the Son, in the same terms as *Arius*. *Marcellus* undertook to refute them, but far from establishng the Pre-existence of the Son, he denied the Divinity of Jesus Christ existed before his Birth; or at least expresst himself in such a manner, that one might believe he regarded the Reason or the Word, not as a being that has his particular Existence, but as I know not what kind of accident, such as is the word, or the sound which is made in speaking. He also very ill treated (a) in the same Book several *Arian* Bishops, as the two *Eusebius*'s, *Paulinus* and *Narcissus*. He charged likewise *Origen* for expounding the Holy Scripture, according to the notions of heathen Philosophers, and especially according to those of *Plato*; from whom *Marcellus* affirmed, he had taken his Doctrin of Principles, which is to say, of the Holy Trinity, of which he had treated after the Platonick fashion. The *Arian* Bishops offended with this Book, had begun to examin it, when they were as yet at *Jerusalem*; but having been obliged to pass over

(c) *id. cap.* 36.

(a) *Euseb. cont. Marcel. lib. 1. c. 4.*

Eusebius and *Theognis* say, that *Arius* had been *kindly* receiv'd by the Bishops, but in no sort, that he was received into Communion, which was, perhaps, for some years refused him, to try his Sincerity. Afterwards they wrote to the Church of *Alexandria*, that she might receive them, and be assured, she would enjoy hence-forward a full Tranquility, Envy having been driv'n out thence, by the Deposal of *Athanasius*. (a) In the mean time this Bishop had gotten to *Constantinople*, to complain to the Emperor of what he had suffered; but he could obtain no Audience of him; all that he could be heard to say, was, That he entreated the Emperor to cite to *Constantinople* the Bishops which were at *Jerusalem*, to have another Examination of his Affair. *Constantin* wrote to *Jerusalem*, and complains in his Letter, that in a time wherein the *Barbarians* began to acknowledge the true God; "The Christians, "who would be thought to have the Mysteries of "God in their keeping, (for he durst not say that "they kept them,) labour'd only to entertain Di"visions and hatred among them, not to say, for "the Destruction of Mankind. And therefore he desired that the Bishops assembled at *Jerusalem*, would meet at *Constantinople*, to examine once for all, the Affair of *Athanasius*, and put some end to it. This Letter being come to *Jerusalem*, some of the Bishops return'd to their Dioceses, and others to *Constantinople*. These last perswaded, according to some Authors, (a) the Emperor, that *Athanasius* had effectually broken his Office; or according to others, (b) that he had threatned to stop the Convoy of Provi-

(c) *Sozom. lib.* II. 28.

(a) *Id.*

(b) *Socr. lib.* I. *cap.* 35.

Provisions which went every year from *Alexandria* to *Constantinople*, of which three Bishops were Witnesses. The Emperor provoked by these Accusations, ordered him to retire to *Treves*, a Town of the *Belgick Gaule*, where he remain'd about two years.

The Bishops who were met at *Constantinople* (c) deposed after this *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, as being fall'n into the opinion of *Paul* of *Samosatia*. One *Asterius* who had taught Rhetorick in *Cappadocia*, having embraced the Christian Religion, had wrote some Books, wherein he spake of the Divinity of the Son, in the same terms as *Arius*. *Marcellus* undertook to refute them, but far from establishing the Pre-existence of the Son, he denied the Divinity of Jesus Christ existed before his Birth; or at least expresst himself in such a manner, that one might believe he regarded the Reason or the Word, not as a being that has his particular Existence, but as I know not what kind of accident, such as is the word, or the sound which is made in speaking. He also very ill treated (a) in the same Book several *Arian* Bishops, as the two *Eusebius*'s, *Paulinus* and *Narcissus*. He charged likewise *Origen* for expounding the Holy Scripture, according to the notions of heathen Philosophers, and especially according to those of *Plato*; from whom *Marcellus* affirmed, he had taken his Doctrin of Principles, which is to say, of the Holy Trinity, of which he had treated after the Platonick fashion. The *Arian* Bishops offended with this Book, had begun to examin it, when they were as yet at *Jerusalem*; but having been obliged to pass over

(c) *id. cap.* 36.

(a) *Euseb. cont. Marcel. lib. 1. c. 4.*

over to *Constantinople*, they had only enjoyned *Marcellus to alter his Opinion*, according to the Stile of that time. He promiſt he would burn his Book, but having not done it, and even refuſing to do it, his affair was reaſſumed at *Conſtantinople*, and he was depoſed. *Euſebius* of *Ceſarea* wrote two Books expreſly againſt him, wherein he criticizes his work, and three others which he entituled, of *Eccleſiaſtick Theology*, wherein he eſtabliſht the opinions which he thought Orthodox touching the Divinity, and refuted thoſe of *Marcellus* and divers other Hereticks. *Marcellus* was afterwards (a) reeſtabliſht in the Synod of *Sardica*; becauſe he affirmed his expreſſions had been miſunderſtood; and being an Enemy to the *Arians*, he inſinuated Himſelf into the Friendſhip of *Athanaſius*, who perhaps was ſurpriz'd by the Equivocal Expreſſions uſed by *Marcellus*. It's certain, that if we may judge of him by the Fragments which *Euſebius* cites, he ſcarcely knew what he would ſay himſelf, or elſe he conceal'd his Opinions under obſcure terms, leſt he ſhould fall into trouble.

(a) *Socr. lib. II. 20. & Soz. lib. II. cap. 29.*

After that *Athanaſius* had been ſent into Exile, (a) *Arius* had returned to *Alexandria*; but his preſence being likely to cauſe a diſorder, by reaſon of the great number of thoſe who followed the ſentiments of *Athanaſius*, the Emperor recalled this Prieſt to *Conſtantinople*, and to aſſure himſelf entirely of his belief, of which the Orthodox ſtill doubted, he offered him the Nicene Creed to ſign, which he did without ballancing, and moreover ſwore he was of that opinion. A report ran that he had hid

(a) *id. lib. I. c. 27. & ſeq.*

hid under his Arm a Writing, which contain'd his Opinion, and that he barely ſwore he believ'd what he had wrote; but there is no great certainty to be expected in what his Enemies ſay of him. Perhaps he thought, like *Euſebius* of *Ceſarea*, that one might give to the words of the Creed a ſenſe which amounted to his ſentiment, although he wiſhat they had made uſe of other terms. What the Fathers of *Nice* ſaid more than he conſiſting in in ſomething abſolutely incomprehenſible; perhaps moreover he counted that for nothing. However *Alexander* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* refuſed to receive him into Communion, although the Emperor had ordered him to do it, and a great number of Biſhops and of the People urged him to it. Beſides this the *Arian* Biſhops were preparing to hold a Council, to examin afreſh the queſtion agitated at *Nice*, and had markt a day in which they were to meet to diſcourſe about it, and to conduct *Arius* into the Church maugre *Alexander*. In this extremity knowing not how to maintain his refuſal, the Hiſtory tells us that he ſhut himſelf up in a Church call'd *Peace*, and ſet himſelf very devoutly to pray to God, not that he would convert *Arius*, or that he would diſcover to himſelf the Truth, but, *that if the opinion of* Arius *was true, he himſelf might not ſee the day ſet apart to diſcourſe of it; or that if his own belief were true,* Arius *who was the cauſe of ſo great miſchiefs, might be puniſht for his Infidelity.* A Prayer ſo little charitable, and whence might be ſeen that this Biſhop was more concern'd for his reputation than the Truth, fail'd not of being heard, ſeeing that the next morning which was

Sunday

Sunday, or the ſame day at night, as *Arius* went to the Church accompani'd by thoſe of his Party, or in ſome other place, for the Hiſtorians vary, in paſſing by the Market of *Conſtantin*, he had ſo great occaſion to go to eaſe himſelf, that he was forced to betake himſelf to the common Privies, where inſtead of finding eaſe, he evacuated his Bowels, and thus died ſuddenly. Since that time Paſſengers were commonly ſhew'd theſe places of eaſement, and no body dared ſit down in the ſame place where *Arius* ſat. 'Tis ſaid that Rich *Arian*, to aboliſh the memory of it, bought afterwards this Place of the Publick, and there built an Houſe.

It's thus that *Ruſinus*, *Socrates*, and *Sozomen* relate the laſt Events of the life of *Arius*. But St. *Athanaſius* ſays that (*a*) having been recalled by the ſolicitations of thoſe of his Party, he offered his Confeſſion of Faith to the Emperor, and ſwore that he did not believe any thing elſe; after which thoſe that protected him would introduce him into the Church, at his going out of the Emperors Palace, but that he died, without having been received into Communion. (*b*) A Learned Man is of Opinion in this matter, *That the* Arius *who was received into Communion at* Jeruſalem, *was a Prieſt of the Party of the famous* Arius, *and not he himſelf, who had already died out of the Communion of the Church*; for without this it muſt be ſaid that *Athanaſius* has been miſtaken. But were it granted him that this Biſhop was miſtaken, in ſpeaking of a Man whom he every moment orewhelmed with injuries, it cannot be found

(*a*) *in Epſt. ad Serapionem.*

(*b*) *De. Valvin.*

found ſtrange, eſpecially not having been at *Conſtantinople* then, when what he relates muſt have hapned. One may farther ſay, that *Athanaſius* has related, by way of abridgment, and little exactly, what he had heard ſay of *Arius*, and that he regarded him as an excommunicated Perſon, having been only received by a Council whoſe Authority *Athanaſius* would not acknowledge, it conſiſting principally of Perſons whoſe opinions had been anathematized at *Nice*. It is far more natural thus to interpret this paſſage of *Athanaſius*, than to reject wholly as falſe an Hiſtory ſo circumſtanc'd as that of the latter years of the life of *Arius*, in reſpect of certain facts which the Hiſtorians, which we have already cited, had no intereſt to alter.

Arius being dead, apparently of a ſudden death, peradventure by Poyſon, which may have given occaſion to the Tragical manner, in which the Hiſtorians mention it, the Diſputes ſtarted on his occaſion dyed not with him: (a) Thoſe who were of *Athanaſius's* Party at *Alexandria*, beſought of God his return in the Publick Prayers, and ceaſed not to importune the Emperor, to make him be recalled. *Conſtantin* was oblig'd to write to the People of that Town a Letter, wherein he upbraided them for their Lightneſs and Folly, and enjoyns the Eccleſiaſticks to remain quiet, and wherein he declares he would not recall *Athanaſius*, whom he treats as a ſeditious Perſon, and one who had been condemned by a Council. He anſwers likewiſe to *Anthony* the Hermit; *That he could not ſlight the Judgment of the Council of* Tyre, *becauſe that ſuppoſing ſome among the Biſhops were paſſionate, yet it is not pro-*

(a) *Socr. lib. II. c. 31.*

 bable

bable that ſo great a number of Wiſe and Learned Biſhops ſhould all of 'em act by paſſion; and that Athanaſius *was an Inſolent Proud and Troubleſom Fellow.*

Conſtantin wrote theſe Letters but a little time before his death, which hapned in the year 337, the circumſtances of which may be ſeen in his life writ by *Euſebius*. Yet we muſt remember, that this is rather a Panegyrick than an unintereſt Hiſtory; whence it is that he ſays nothing of the death of his two Wives, and the eldeſt Son of this Emperor, whom he had put to death thro' jealouſy or revenge.

Euſebius was always of the *Arians* ſide. Yet *Socrates* has undertaken to juſtifie him, (*b*) and ſo do's Dr. *Cave* ſeem to do, thinking himſelf thereto obliged thro' Chriſtian Charity; whereas the love of truth ſhould oblige all Hiſtorians never to vary from it. But it is this pretended charity, which extends it ſelf only to Fathers which are reſpected as Orthodox, which has been the cauſe that we have in a manner only Panegyricks of the Ancients, wherein their defects are ever ſuppreſt, when they cannot be covered with the maſk of ſome Vertues.

(*b*) Socr. lib. II. c. 21.

Euſebius, as it appears by the conduct he held at the Council of *Nice*, was a dextrous Perſon, who did not ſcruple to ſubſcribe to terms which were not pleaſing to him, provided he could expound them in a ſenſe according to his mind, tho' little conformable to that of thoſe who ſet them up. For in fine, a Man muſt ſhut his Eyes, touching what he ſays in his Letter to the Church of *Ceſarea*, not to ſee, that he underſtood otherwiſe the terms of the Symbol, than *Athanaſius* did. He was a great admirer of *Origen*, ſeveral of whoſe opinions may be ſeen in his life; he lived not long after *Conſtantin*, for he dyed in the

the year 340. St. *Jerome* in several places calls him *Signifer et Princeps Arianorum*; Speaking of the great *Eusebius* Bishop of *Cesarea*.

Athanasius in his banishment wrote a Creed at *Rome*, which he presented to a Council sitting there, yet that Creed was not publish'd till above three hundred years after in the *Toletan* Council, as *Baronius* himself owns, neither can any one tell us what that was; for that which passes commonly amongst us under the name of the *Athanasian Creed*, and is read in our Churches, was drawn up by God knows who, as *Vossius de Tribus Symbolis*, *Camerarius*, and *Ell. du Pin in his B. des Aut. Eccles.* do ingenuously confess. For how durst *Athanasius* make a new Creed after the Nicene? Besides, no Writer of that time mentions it, no not *Athanasius* himself. It seems to have been broach't above 600 years after that age, in which time a profound ignorance had overspread Christendom; however the Eastern Churches would never own it, no not at this day. See more in the above mentioned learned Authors.

Constantin being dead, *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, a refin'd Courtier, soon made himself Master of *Constantius*, and all the Grandees of the Palace, in whom he rooted his beloved *Arianism*; being assisted by *Constantia's* Priest, the Empress was soon gain'd over, and the Roman Empire became for the most part *Arian*, *Athanasius* being condemn'd not only by many Eastern, but also by several great Western Councils. Afterwards they fell so to *Logger-heads*, that the Western Church excommunicated the Eastern, and the Eastern return'd the same Complement upon the Western, and there we'll leave them.

FINIS.